27—5

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J. 10-7
24

Case 9 Div. 1

BX 5037 .B32 1845 v.7
Barrow, Isaac, 1630-1677.
The works of Isaac Barrow

v.7

Published First of April, 1831, Price 5*s.* 6*d.* in cloth boards,

(TO BE CONTINUED MONTHLY.)

VOL. I. OF THE

EPITOME

OF

ENGLISH LITERATURE;

OR,

A Concentration of the Matter of Standard English Authors,

On a plan entirely new:

WITH PORTRAITS, BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES, &c.

EDITED AND PRINTED UNDER THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF

A. J. VALPY, M. A.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF PEMB. COLL., OXFORD.

'Were all books reduced to their quintessence, many a bulky author would make his appearance in a pamphlet; there would be scarce such a thing as a folio; and the works of an age would be contained on a few shelves.'—ADDISON.

MUCH as we owe to the invention of printing, its good is not intirely without alloy. From the facilities it presents to the rapid march of mind, books are multiplied as if by magic; but at the same time the sterling works of each successive age are thus, from the want of leisure to read them, rapidly displaced by literature of a lighter cast, whose aim it is 'to play round the heart, but never reach the head.'

To divert in part the interest felt for such productions, it is intended to publish, in a *concentrated form, a Series of* STANDARD ENGLISH AUTHORS; of whose works the present generation know little, and the rising youth must know less; although the names, at least, of such writers are 'familiar in our mouths as household words,' and the information they convey, suited to all times, places, and conditions of men, is clothed in language, which has of necessity remained sta-

tionary, whilst modes of thinking and writing have insensibly changed.

But though powerful in mind and rich in matter are the writers of England's proudest period, still they are all deficient in the one thing needful—brevity; and thus the very points, on which they plumed themselves in their own days, have led to their present partial neglect. Ever more afraid of saying too little than too much, they have imposed on posterity the task of pruning luxuriances and removing blemishes, by the rejection of what is superfluous in matter and quaint in style; but not without the double advantage on our part of retaining all that is useful, and of imparting a new interest to it by the system of CONCENTRATION.

Of the value of such a principle the best proof is given by the unimitated and inimitable authors of Greece and Rome. Varied as their works are in subject and style, they all unite in the leading point, to give the *maximum* of information in the *minimum* of space, and have thus been able, independent of their intrinsic value, to outlive not only the darker ages, but to throw a lustre even on more enlightened times.

From the limits of a Prospectus, it is impossible to state the precise nature of the plan intended to be adopted: suffice it to observe, that in *History* no facts, and in *Philosophy* no reasoning, will be omitted or distorted, so as to render a reference to the original author requisite; and thus the youth especially of both sexes may become perfectly acquainted with authors repulsive from their bulk alone, at a comparatively little cost of time as well as price.

The Series will be confined to the popular productions of writers in Prose, and the following Authors will be first selected:

HISTORICAL.	PHILOSOPHICAL.	MISCELLANEOUS.
BURNET.	BACON.	ADDISON.
CLARENDON.	LOCKE.	GOLDSMITH.
GIBBON.	PALEY.	JOHNSON.
HUME.		MILTON.
ROBERTSON.		SWIFT.

The Work is printed in small Octavo, in monthly volumes, averaging 350 pages, price 5*s.* 6*d.*; and any Author may be purchased *separately* at a small advance of price.

Vol. I. contains

PALEY'S MORAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY,

WITH PORTRAIT, LIFE, &c.

No. II. will contain PALEY'S EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY; and LOCKE on the HUMAN UNDERSTANDING; with a Portrait.—CLARENDON, GIBBON, ADDISON, JOHNSON, &c. will succeed LOCKE.

Orders received by A. J. VALPY, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street; and by all Booksellers in the United Kingdom.

OPINIONS.

'The pruning hand of an editor is to go over the historical and philosophical volumes, and the rising generation are to have all the old lumbering quartos and octavos compressed into duodecimo, and to become masters of philosophy, with a comparatively trifling cost of time, labor, and money. So be it! we only regret that we were born a generation too soon. The present specimen certainly speaks well for the work; and, with its portrait and very excellent biographical sketch, will be welcome to many a freshman, either in or out of the Universities.'—*Athenæum.*

'As a short cut and royal road to knowlege, the plan cannot be too much recommended. The majority of readers cannot be brought to a cordial intimacy with Bacon or Paley—possibly they may dip into them in this accessible shape. Philosophy will be shorn of its dulness and terrors. If the work produce this end, it will not have been undertaken in vain.'—*Atlas.*

'The plan which the editors have adopted is admirable. Great skill and care are apparent in the accomplishment of the difficult task of condensing the writings of Paley; and we heartily recommend the work to general patronage.'—*Weekly Dispatch.*

'The sterling merit of Paley's works is so well known, and so generally acknowleged, that to offer a fresh panegyric would be an attempt, indeed, 'to gild refined gold.' The selection of such an author, however, for the commencement of a series of publications principally designed for the rising generation, affords a fair guarantee of the good taste and correct feeling of the Editors; while the plan of the work presents a new feature to lure the youthful reader to study those authors he has hitherto rejected, from their tedious prolixity, by placing before him the beauties of our best writers, unaccom-

panied by that quaintness and exuberance of style, which too often characterise their most esteemed productions.'—*Constitution.*

'Of the value of this undertaking little doubt can be entertained, when we consider that the production of some even of our most favorite historians and philosophers are swelled out to an unnecessary size, by redundancy of style and minute and trifling amplification; so that the student is deterred from consulting such authorities, merely from contemplating the mass of reading he has to encounter in the prosecution of his particular inquiry.'—*Manchester Advertiser.*

'He, who condenses the spirit of works of real merit, and gives to the thoughts of authors a new and more convenient mode of communication, renders an important benefit to society. Even the best authors have about them much verbiage, which though it may adorn does not instruct—and rare indeed are those books which will not bear the pruning knife. The specimen before us presents all the essence of Paley, leaving behind in the retort nothing but the *caput mortuum* of superfluous words.'—*Essex Herald.*

'This plan is entirely novel, and will undoubtedly prove a new era in literature. It will, in our opinion, be eminently useful, and meet with the most decided success. This system of condensation is very different, as well as much superior, to the usual plan of abridgments. We shall be much mistaken if the reader will not admit that nothing really essential is lost, and, at the same time, that the work gains in force what it loses in bulk. If this be granted, the utility of the whole plan is at once evident.'—*Bury and Suffolk Herald.*

'The system of expurgation adopted by the learned editor we consider a great advantage to readers in general, as they will obtain all that is essential to amusement and instruction, without the trouble of wading through the superfluous matter which it is too much the fashion to introduce even into works of our very best authors.'—*Derbyshire Courier.*

'This is a new attempt in the progress of literature, and we trust will prove as successful as it is novel. The youth of either sex can now have no excuse for not becoming directly acquainted with many standard English Authors, from the hitherto something like valid plea, that they either drew too largely on their time or their means.'—*Exeter Flying Post.*

'Of all the novelties in literature which have lately made their appearance, we look on the present undertaking as by far the most useful and important. How few are there that will make even an attempt to wade through the prolix pages of Clarendon and Burnet; while a mere glance at Grotius, Puffendorf, or even Vattel or De Lolme, is sufficient to scare any but the really studious from a perusal of their tomes. But by the plan now happily in progress, all that is really useful and important will be condensed into a small and readable volume. A wide field is open to the projectors: and we trust that success may induce them to continue their labors, till not an author of merit is left to moulder on the shelves of unapproachable libraries.'—*Brighton Gazette.*

THE WORKS

OF

DR. ISAAC BARROW.

VOL. VII.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/worksofdrisaacba07barr

THE WORKS

OF

DR. ISAAC BARROW.

WITH

SOME ACCOUNT OF HIS LIFE,

SUMMARY OF EACH DISCOURSE, NOTES, &c.

BY THE REV. T. S. HUGHES, B.D.

VOL. VII.

LONDON:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. J. VALPY, M.A.

AND SOLD BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

1831.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SEVENTH VOLUME.

PAGE

An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer. 1

An Exposition of the Decalogue. 21

The Doctrine of the Sacraments. 66

A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy. 86

SUPPOSITION I.—That St. Peter had a primacy over the Apostles. 144

II.—That St. Peter's primacy, with its rights and prerogatives, was not personal, but derivable to his successors. 200

III.—That St. Peter was bishop of Rome. 207

PAGE

IV.—That St. Peter did continue bishop of Rome after his translation, and was so at his decease. . . . 214

V.—That the bishops of Rome (according to God's institution, and by original right derived thence) should have an universal supremacy and jurisdiction over the Christian Church. 221

VI.—That in fact the Roman bishops continually from St. Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this sovereign power. 331

VII.—That this power is indefectible and unalterable. 434

A Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church. . . . 457

Index. 505

SUMMARY OF AN

EXPOSITION ON THE LORD'S PRAYER.

PREVIOUS observations. Meaning of prayer: prayer considered, 1. as a natural duty and debt to God, &c.: 2. as a most useful means, or a condition requisite, for the procuring of benefits and blessings: 3. as an effectual instrument working in us all true good, &c.: 4. as a high privilege and advantage conferred on us. In the due performance of this duty we are directed and assisted by this *form*, dictated by him who best knew what we ought to pray for, and how we ought to pray; &c. The particulars of it considered.

Our Father. What the expression, *our* Father, implies, stated: the relation which it intimates between God and us considered; the encouragement which it affords us; and the disposition of mind in which we should approach him.

Which art in heaven. Though his universality must be admitted, there is a place where he reigns in supreme majesty: this described.

Hallowed, or sanctified, *be thy name.* Observation of St. Chrysostom, that we receive a direction in all our prayers, to have a prime and principal regard to God's glory. This clause involves both praise and petition; expresses both our acknowlegement of what is, and our desire of what should be: this enlarged on.

Thy kingdom come. This petition subordinate to the former: meaning of this kingdom stated, as the condition of religion under the evangelical dispensation: reasons why the Apostles should in their days desire this; and why we, by parity of

reasoning, should desire that the Christian religion should be advanced and confirmed.

Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. This sentence embraces praise, good desire, and petition. 1. We profess our approbation of all God's counsels, &c. 2. We express our desire that as in heaven so in earth all his designs may pass without opposition. 3. We pray that God would grant us grace willingly to perform all that he requires of us, &c.

Give us this day our daily bread. Two senses of the word *daily* pointed out; *that* of the time to come, and *that* necessary for the present preservation of our lives. Observations on the petition itself.

And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. Different expositions of St. Mark and St. Luke, from this of St. Matthew. Observations on this petition, and our own obligations when we make it.

Lead us not into temptation. Different senses in which *temptation* may be taken. That which is here signified, any violent allurement to sin, &c. Manner in which God may be said to bring us into such, explained. Necessity of his interposition to support and save us; &c.

But deliver us from evil. Ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. This taken by St. Chrysostom for *the Devil*, that is, the tempter. Taken here according to the more common acceptation, *from evil:* this explained. Our request made here, as elsewhere, in general terms, the distinct matter, manner, and measure, being left to God's wisdom and goodness.

For thine is the kingdom, &c. We shut up all with a doxology, signifying our faith, affection, and reverence towards God. Explanation of the terms of this doxology.

AN

EXPOSITION ON THE LORD'S PRAYER.

AMONG all the duties prescribed to us by our religion, the rendering due worship to God is in nature and for consequence the principal; God thereby being most directly honored and served, we from it immediately deriving most ample and high benefits; to the performance of which duty we are furnished with excellent direction and assistance from that prayer, which our Lord (at several times and on several occasions) dictated, and recommended to his disciples, both as a pattern, according to which they should regulate their devotions, ('Pray thus,' or in this manner, saith he in St. Matthew,) and as a form, in which they should express them; ('When you pray, say;' that is, say this, or in these words; so he enjoins them in St. Luke:) unto it therefore we should carefully attend, as to our best rule; and we should frequently use it as our best matter of devotion: to the well performing of both which duties, it is requisite that we should distinctly understand the particulars contained therein; in order to which purpose we shall endeavor to explain them: but first let us premise a few words in general about prayer.

Prayer, in its latitude of acceptation, doth comprehend all devotion, or worship immediately addressed unto Almighty God; consisting of praise, which we render to God in regard to his most excellent perfections and glorious works; of submissive gratulation, declaring our satisfaction in all the dispensations of his most wise and just providence; of thanksgiving, for the numberless great benefits we have received from him; of acknowleging our total dependence on him, and our subjection to him; of professing faith in him, and vowing service to him; of confessing the sins we have committed against him, with the guilt and aggravation of them; of deprecating the wrath and punishment due to us for our offences; of petition for all things needful and convenient for us; of intercession for

others, whose good we according to duty or charity are concerned to desire and promote; prayer, I say, (although, according to its most restrained sense, it only doth signify one of these particulars, namely, the petition of what is needful or expedient for us, yet,) in its larger acception, as it commonly is used, it doth comprise them all: and so we may well take it here; this form, although so very brief, being with so admirable wisdom contrived, as without straining the words beyond their natural importance, we may, applying a moderate attention, discern them all, as to their main substance, couched therein; so that we may indeed reasonably regard this prayer as a complete directory, and a full exercise of all our devotion toward God: of devotion, I say, the which (to engage, excite, and encourage us to the careful and constant practice thereof) we may consider enjoined us as a necessary duty, commended to us as a requisite means of good, and a special instrument of all piety, and as a high privilege granted to us by God.

1. It is a natural duty and debt we owe to God, (both in correspondence to the design of our being made and endowed with rational capacities agreeable to our relations; and in requital for our being, and for all the good we have, and do continually receive from him,) as most highly to love and reverence him in our hearts, so to declare our esteem of his excellences, and our sense of his bounty toward us, to avow the dependence we have on his will and providence; the obligations we are under to his mercy and goodness; to yield our due homage of respect, submission, and obedience to him: if we do acknowlege a God, our Maker, our Lord, our continual benefactor, to be, we must consequently acknowlege these performances in reason, justice, and gratitude due to him; and God accordingly requires, and positively enjoins them: he is 'the Lord our God, whom we must worship and serve;' the God 'whom praise waiteth for; who heareth prayers, and to whom therefore all flesh must come.' The Scripture is very frequent in commanding the duty.

2. It is a most useful means, or a condition requisite, for the procurement of benefits and blessings on us. God hath declared that he doth accept, he hath promised that he will reward, all devotions with an honest intention and pure mind offered up unto him; that he 'is nigh unto all them that call on him in truth;' that he will 'be found of them who seek him with all their heart;' that 'he will fulfil the desire of them that fear him; he will hear their cry, and will save them;' that 'they who seek him shall not want any good thing;' that, 'whatever we ask in prayer believing, we shall receive;' that

'if we ask, it shall be given us; if we seek, we shall find; if we knock, it shall be opened to us.' Prayer is also a means of procuring a blessing on all our undertakings; it sanctifieth every performance, &c. There is no good thing so great and precious; so high above the reach of common power; so strange to expect, or difficult to compass, which we may not easily and surely by this means obtain; relief in all distresses, both of our outward and inward estate; supplies of all our needs, both corporal and spiritual; comfort in all our sorrows and sadnesses; satisfaction in all our doubts and darknesses of mind; help and strength against all our temptations, we may be confident to obtain, if we duly seek them from the Almighty Dispenser of all good gifts: sure promises there are, and obvious examples hereof, too many to be now recited: as, on the other hand, they that will neglect this duty, that will not vouchsafe to seek help and remedy of God, may be sure to want it; shall certainly suffer for their proud contempt, profane diffidence, or foolish sloth; 'You will not,' saith our Saviour, 'come to me, that ye may have life:' no wonder then if they do not receive it, if they will not go thither for it, where only it is to be had. All good things are in God's hand; and we shall never by any force or policy get them thence without his will, moved by entreaty: all good gifts come from heaven; and thence we shall never fetch them down, without ascending thither in our hearts and affections; spiritual goods especially are so high above us, that we can never reach them otherwise than by God's help by humble supplication obtained.

3. It is not only a means, by impetration acquiring for us, but it is an effectual instrument working in us, all true good; it is the channel by which God conveyeth spiritual light into our minds, and spiritual vigor into our hearts. It is both the seed and the food of spiritual life; by which all holy dispositions of soul, and all honest resolutions of practice, are bred and nourished, are augmented and strengthened in us. It exciteth, it quickeneth, it maintaineth all pious affections; the love of God can no otherwise than by it be kindled, fomented, or kept in life, (without it we certainly shall have an estrangement, and an aversation from him;) it alone can maintain a constant reverence and awe of God, keeping him in our thoughts, and making us to live as in his presence; it chiefly enliveneth and exerciseth our faith and our hope in God; it is that which begetteth in our hearts a savory relish of divine things, which sweeteneth and endeareth to our souls the practice of piety, which only can enable us with delight and alacrity to obey God's commandments; it alone can raise our minds, from the

cares and concernments of this world, to a sense and desire of heavenly things. By it God imparteth strength to subdue bad inclinations, to restrain sensual appetites, to compress irregular passions; to evade the allurements to evil, and the discouragements from good, which this world always presenteth; to support also with patience and equanimity the many crosses and troubles we must surely meet with therein. It is, in short, the only strong bulwark against temptation and sin; the only sure guard of piety and a good conscience; no man indeed can be a faithful servant to God, a real friend to goodness, a serious practiser of duty, without a constant tenor of devotion.

4. It is a most high privilege and advantage to us, that we are allowed to pray and address our devotions to God. To have a free access to the presence and audience of an earthly prince (to the effect of receiving from him all that we could desire) would be deemed a matter of great honor and much advantage: how much more is it so to us, that we are admitted to the presence and ear of the great King of all the world; so mighty in power, so large in bounty, so full of goodness and pity; so thoroughly able, so exceedingly willing to grant and perform our requests! How sweet a thing, of what comfort and benefit is it, to have the liberty of 'pouring out our souls and our hearts,' as the psalmist speaks, before God; of disburdening our minds of all their cares, their desires, their doubts, their griefs and anxieties, into the breast of so kind a friend, so wise a counsellor, so able a helper; who alone indeed can afford relief, ease, satisfaction, and comfort to us! Considering which things we shall appear, not only very disobedient to God, and highly ingrateful toward him, (who so infinitely condescends in vouchsafing to us dust and ashes (vile and unworthy creatures) leave to speak and converse with him,) but very injurious and unfaithful to ourselves, and to our own good; if we neglect this duty commanded, or slight this privilege indulged to us.

In the due performance of which we are directed and assisted by this form of prayer, composed and dictated for that purpose by him, who best knew what we ought to pray for, and how we ought to pray; what matter of desire, what manner of address, what disposition of mind would be most pleasing and acceptable to his Father, would most become and befit us in our approaches to him. We might consequently observe many things concerning those particulars discernible in this form: the sublimity, the gravity, the necessity, the singular choiceness of the matter; together with the fit order and just disposition thereof, according to the natural precedence of things in dignity or necessity; the full brevity, the deep plainness, the comely

simplicity of expression; the lowly reverence signified therein, accompanied with due faith and confidence: these, and the like virtues directive of our devotion, we might observe running generally through the whole contexture of this venerable form: but we shall rather choose to take notice of them as they shall offer themselves in their particular places; to the consideration of which in order we now do apply ourselves.

Our Father which art in Heaven.

Our Father: on this title, or manner of compellation, we may first observe, that although our Saviour prescribeth this form as a pattern, and an exercise of private prayer to be performed in the closet, (and alone in secret, as is expressed in the gospel,) yet he directeth us to make our addresses to God in a style of plurality, saying, not my Father, but our Father; thereby, it seems, implying, 1. That we should in our prayers consider and acknowlege the universality of God's power and goodness. 2. That we should not in our conceit proudly and vainly appropriate or engross the regard of God unto ourselves; but remember that our brethren have an equal share with us therein. 3. That in all our devotions we should be mindful of those common bands which knit us together as men and as Christians, (the band of nature and humanity; the more strict ties of common faith and hope; of manifold relations unto God that made us, and our Saviour that redeemed us, and the Holy Spirit who animateth and quickeneth us, and combineth us in spiritual union.) 4. That we should bear such hearty good-will and charitable affection toward others, as not only to seek and desire our own particular and private good, but that of all men; especially of all good Christians; who in a peculiar manner are God's children and our brethren: 'He did not bid us say, my Father, but our Father, who art in heaven; that being taught that we have a common Father, we might show a brotherly good-will one toward another,' saith St. Chrysostom.

As for the appellation Father, it doth mind us of our relation to God, who on many grounds, and in divers high respects, is our Father; (by nature, for that he gave us our being, and made us after his own image; by providence, for that he continually preserveth and maintaineth us; by grace, for that he reneweth us to his image in righteousness and holiness; by adoption, for that he alloweth us the benefit and privilege of his children, assigning an eternal inheritance to us;) of this relation, which as creatures, as men, as Christians, we bear to

God, it mindeth us, and consequently how we ought in correspondence thereto to behave ourselves; yielding to him all respect, affection, and observance; demeaning ourselves in all things as becomes such a relation and rank: this indeed of all God's names, titles, and attributes, is chosen as most suitable to the nature of the present duty; as most encouraging to the performance thereof; as most fully implying the dispositions required in us, when we apply ourselves thereto. Our Saviour used to compare prayer to a son's asking nourishment of his father; arguing thence what success and benefit we may expect from it: we come therein to God, not (directly) as to a lord or master, to receive commands; but rather as to a father, to request from him the sustenance of our life, and supply of our needs; to render withal unto him our thankful asknowlegements, for having continuedly done those things for us; and to demonstrate our dutiful respect and affection toward him. It is natural for children in any danger, strait, or want, to fly to their parents for shelter, relief, and succor: and it is so likewise for us to have recourse unto God, in all those cases wherein no visible means of help appear from elsewhere: and to do so the title of Father doth encourage us, signifying not only power and authority over us, but affection and dearness toward us: the name God, importing his excellent perfections; the name Lord, minding us of his power and empire over us, with the like titles declarative of his supereminent majesty, might deter us, being conscious of our meanness and unworthiness, from approaching to him; but the word Father is attractive and emboldening; thinking on that we shall be apt to conceive hope, that, how mean, how unworthy soever, yet being his children, he will not reject or refuse us; for, 'If men, being evil, do give good gifts unto their children; how much more will our Father, which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him?'

It also plainly intimates how qualified and disposed in mind we should come to God; namely, with high reverence, with humble affection, with hearty gratitude; as to the Author of our being, to him that hath continually preserved and brought us up; from whose care and providence we have received all the good we have ever enjoyed; from whose mercy and favor we can only expect any good for the future. By calling God Father, we avow ourselves obliged to honor and love him incomparably beyond all things; we also declare our faith and hope in God; that we believe him well affected toward us, and willing to do us good; and that we thence hope to receive the good desirable from him, (the which are dispositions necessary

to the due performance of this duty.) It also implieth that we should come thereto with purity of mind and good conscience, which is also requisite to the same intent; for if we are conscious of undutiful and disobedient carriage toward God, how can we call him Father? with what heart or face can we assume to ourselves the title of children? 'If,' saith St. Peter, 'ye call on him as Father, who impartially judges according to every man's work,' (that is, who only esteemeth them for his children who truly behave themselves as becometh children,) 'pass the time of your pilgrimage in fear,' (or in reverence toward God.) We may add, that we also hereby may be supposed to express our charity toward our brethren; who bear unto God, the Father of all men, the same common relation. But I proceed:

Which art in Heaven.

God Almighty is substantially present every where; but he doth not every where in effects discover himself alike, nor with equal splendor in all places display the beams of his glorious majesty. The Scripture frequently mentioneth a place of his special residence, (seated in regions of inaccessible light, above the reach, not only of our sense, but of our fancy and conception,) where his royal court, his presence-chamber, his imperial throne are; where he is more immediately attended on by the glorious angels and blessed saints; which place is called heaven, the highest heavens; the τὰ ὕψιστα, the highest places; by his presence wherein God is described here, as for distinction from all other parents here on earth, so to increase reverence in us toward him, (while we reflect on his supereminent glory and majesty,) and to raise our hearts from these inferior things unto desire, and hope, and love of heavenly things; 'withdrawing,' saith St. Chrysostom, 'him that prays from earth, and fastening him to the places on high, and to the mansions above.' But so much for the title.

The first sentence of our prayer is,

Hallowed (or sanctified) be thy Name.

Let us first (with St. Chrysostom) observe the direction we hence receive in all our prayers to have a prime and principal regard to the glory of God; not seeking any thing concerning our own good before his praise: that for the order. As to the substance of this particular we may consider that sanctity implying a discrimination, a distance, an exaltment in nature or

use of the thing, which is denominated thereby; and God's name signifying himself with all that we can know of him; himself, as however discovered or declared, with all that relates to him, and bears his inscription; we do here accordingly express our due acknowlegements and desires; for by a rare complication this sentence doth involve both praise and petition; doth express both our acknowlegement of what is, and our desire of what should be: we do, I say, hereby partly acknowlege and praise the supereminent perfections of God above all things, in all kind of excellency, joining in that seraphical doxology, (which to utter is the continual employment of the blessed spirits above, who incessantly day and night cry out,) 'Holy, holy, holy;' confessing with the heavenly host in the Apocalypse, that 'he is worthy of all honor, glory, and power:' we do also partly declare our hearty wishes, that God may be every where had in highest veneration; that all things relating to him may receive their due regard; that all honor and praise, all duty and service, may in a peculiar manner be rendered unto him by all men, by all creatures, by ourselves especially: that all minds may entertain good and worthy opinions of him; all tongues speak well of him, celebrate and bless him; all creatures yield adoration to his name, and obedience to his will: that he be worshipped in truth and sincerity, with zeal and fervency: this particularly in the Prophet Isaiah, and by St. Peter, is called sanctifying God's name in opposition to idolatrous and profane religion: ('Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, let him be your dread,' saith the Prophet; and, 'Fear not their fear, nor be troubled, but sanctify the Lord God in your hearts,' saith the Apostle.) Thus do we here pray and wish in respect to all men, and to all creatures capable of thus sanctifying God's name; but more particularly we pray for ourselves, that God would grant to us, that we, by our religious and righteous conversation, may bring honor to his name; so that 'men seeing our good works may glorify our Father which is in heaven.' ('Vouchsafe, saith he, that we may live so purely, that all men by us may glorify thee:' so descants St. Chrysostom.)

Thy Kingdom come.

THIS petition, or devout wish, being subordinate to the former, as expressing a main particular of that, which is there generally desired, (we here to the glory of God desiring a successful and speedy propagation of true religion,) seems, in its direct and immediate sense, to respect the state of things in

that time, more especially befitting our Lord's disciples then, when the kingdom of God (that is, the state of religion under the evangelical dispensation) was coming and approaching; (according to that of our Saviour in St. Luke; 'I say unto you of a truth, there be some of you standing here that shall not taste death, till they see the kingdom of God;') whence it did become them in zeal to God's glory, and charity for men's salvation, to desire that Christianity might soon effectually be propagated over the world, being generally entertained by men with due faith and obedience; that is, that all men willingly might acknowlege God as their Lord and Maker, worshipping and serving him in truth; that they might receive his blessed Son Jesus Christ as their King and Saviour, heartily embracing his doctrine, and humbly submitting to his laws: to which purpose our Lord enjoins his disciples to 'pray, that the Lord of the harvest would send laborers into his harvest;' and St. Paul exhorts the Thessalonians to pray, 'that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified.' And in parity of reason, on the same grounds, we are concerned, and obliged to desire, that Christian religion may be settled and confirmed; may grow and be increased; may prosper and florish in the world; that God's authority may, to the largest extension of place, to the highest intention of degree, universally and perfectly, be maintained and promoted, both in external profession and real effect; the minds of all men being subdued to the obedience of faith; and avowing the subjection due to him; and truly yielding obedience to all his most just and holy laws. Thus should we pray that God's kingdom may come; particularly desiring that it may so come into our own hearts; humbly imploring his grace, that he thereby would rule in our hearts, quelling in them all exorbitant passions and vicious desires, protecting them from all spiritual enemies, disposing them to an intire subjection to his will, and a willing compliance with all his commandments: for this is 'the kingdom of God,' which, as our Lord telleth us, 'is within us;' the which doth not, as St. Paul teaches us, 'consist in meat and drink,' (in any outward formal performances,) 'but in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;' that is, in obedience to God's will, and in the comfortable consequences thereof: this is the kingdom of God, which we are enjoined, before any worldly accommodations, first to seek.

Thy Will be done in Earth, as it is in Heaven.

THIS sentence is likewise complicated of praise, good desire,

and petition; for we thereby first do acknowlege the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God in all resolutions of his will and dispensations of his providence.

1. We profess our approbation of all God's counsels, our complacence and satisfaction in all his proceedings, our cheerful submission and consent to all his pleasure; joining our suffrage, and saying in harmony with that blessed choir in the Revelation, 'Great and wonderful are thy works, O Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, O thou King of Saints.' We disclaim our own judgments and conceits, we renounce our own desires and designs, so far as they appear inconsistent with the determinations of God's wisdom, or discordant with his pleasure; saying after our Lord, 'Let not my will, but thine be done.'

2. We do also express our desire, that as in heaven all things with a free and undisturbed course do pass according to God's will and good-liking, every intimation of his pleasure finding there a most intire and ready compliance from those perfectly loyal and pious spirits, ('those ministers of his, that do his pleasure,' as the psalmist calls them,) so that here on earth the gracious designs of God may be accomplished without opposition or rub; that none should presume, as the pharisees and lawyers are said to do, ἀθετεῖν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, to disappoint or defeat God's counsel; ἀπωθεῖσθαι, to thrust away or repulse God's word, as the Jews did in the Acts; to resist, provoke, or defy God by obstinate disobedience, as many are said to do in the Scriptures; but that every where a free, humble, hearty, and full obedience be rendered to his commands.

3. We do also pray that God would grant us the grace willingly to perform whatever he requires of us, ('perfecting us,' as the Apostle speaketh, 'in every good work to do his will,' and 'working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight,') contentedly to bear whatever he layeth on us; that God would bestow on us a perfect resignation of our wills unto his will; a cheerful acquiescence in that state and station wherin he hath placed us; a submiss patience in all adversities, whereinto he disposeth us to fall; a constant readiness with satisfaction and thankfulness (without reluctancy or repining) to receive whatever cometh from his will, whether grateful or distasteful to our present sense: acknowleging his wisdom, his goodness, his justice in all his dealings towards us; heartily saying with good Eli, 'It is the Lord, let him do what seemeth him good;' with Hezekiah, 'Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken:' with David, 'Behold, here I am; let him do

to me as seemeth good to him;' with Job, 'Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?' and, 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord:' yea, it were well, if we could, after the heathen philosopher, on all occasions with our hearts say, εἰ ταύτῃ Θεῷ φίλον, ταύτῃ γενέσθω· 'If God will have it so, so let it be:' if we could observe those rules and precepts, which even the philosophers so much inculcate; to commit all our affairs to God, to love and embrace (hug) all events; to follow, and to accompany God; to yield, deliver, and resign ourselves up to him: (*Deo se præbere, dedere, tradere*, &c.) and the like.

Give us this Day our daily Bread.

I SHALL not stand to criticise on the hard word here used, translated 'daily;' I only say, that of two senses offering themselves, both are probable, and by good authority countenanced; both are proper and suitable to the matter or nature of the thing: according to one, we pray for the bread τοῦ ἐπιόντος, 'of the time to come,' or of that future life, which it shall please God to allow us: according to the other, we request bread ἐπὶ τὸ εἶναι, which is necessary for our being, and the preservation of our lives; joining both together, (which is more sure and safe,) we pray for a competent provision toward the maintenance of our life hereafter, during our appointed time: that for the sense: on the petition itself we observe,

1. That after we have rendered our due tribute of praise and respect unto God, we are allowed and directed to request of him good things for ourselves; beginning, as nature prompteth, with the preservation of our beings and lives; whereby we become capable of receiving and enjoying other good things;

2. By doing which we also do imply the sense we have of our total dependence on God; avowing ourselves to subsist by his care and bounty; disclaiming consequently all confidence in any other means to maintain or support us; in any store we have laid up, or estate we pretend to; in any contrivance or industry we can use; in any succor of friends or relations; for that, notwithstanding all these, we do need our daily bread to be dealt to us by God, and must continually beg it as a gift from his hands.

3. We are by that word, σήμερον, 'this day,' taught our duty (signifying withal our performance thereof) of being willing

continually to rely on God; not affecting to be ever so much beforehand, as not to need God's constant assistance: we ask not that God would give us at once what may serve us for ever, and may put us out of any fear to want hereafter; we ask not for that which may suffice for a long time, for many years, many months, many days; but that God would give us to-day, or rather 'day by day;' (τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, as it is expressed in St. Luke;) that is, that he would continually dispense to us what is needful for us: we should not therefore desire to have an estate settled on us; to live by ourselves, or on our own incomes; to be set out of God's house, or immediate protection and care; this in itself cannot be, (for God cannot alienate his goods from himself, nor can we subsist out of his hand,) nor must we desire it should be: it is a part of atheism, or infidelity, of heathenish profaneness and folly, to desire it, ('these things,' saith our Lord, 'do the Gentiles seek;' that is, they are covetous of wealth, and careful for provisions, to live without dependence on God;) but we must esteem God's providence our surest estate, God's bounty our best treasure, God's fatherly care our most certain and most comfortable support; 'casting all our care on him,' as being assured that 'he careth for us;' 'will not leave nor forsake us;' will not withhold what is necessary for our comfortable sustenance.

4. It is here intimated, how sober and moderate our appetites should be, in regard both to the quality and quantity of the things we use: we are directed to ask τροφὴν, οὐ τρυφὴν, as St. Chrysostom says, necessary food, not luxurious plenty or delicacy: it is bread, (the most simple, homely, and common diet;) that is, such accommodations as are necessary to maintain our lives, and satisfy our natural desires; not superfluities, serving to please our wanton appetites, or humor our curious fancies; it is not variety, daintiness, elegancy, or splendor, we should affect to enjoy, but be content to have our necessities supplied with the coarsest diet and the meanest apparel, if our condition requireth it, or God's providence in an honest way allotteth no other to us: we may soberly and thankfully enjoy what God sends; but we should not presume to ask for or desire other than this.

And for the measure, we learn to ask only for so much as shall be fit to maintain us; not for rich or plentiful store; not for full barns, or for heaps of treasure; not for wherewith to glut, or pamper ourselves; but for daily bread, a moderate provision, then to be dealt to us, when we need it.

It follows,

And forgive us our Trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us; 'our trespasses;' it is 'our debts' (ὀφειλήματα) in St. Matthew; 'our sins' (ἁμαρτίας) in St. Luke; and they who trespass against us are in both Evangelists called 'our debtors:' for he that injures another is obnoxious and in debt to him; owing him satisfaction, either by making reparation, or undergoing punishment.

AFTER the preservation of our beings, (the foundation of enjoying other good things,) our first care, we see, ought to be concerning the welfare of our better part and state; which chiefly consists in the terms whereon we stand toward God, on whose favor all our happiness dependeth, and from whose displeasure all our misery must proceed: since therefore we all do stand obnoxious to God's wrath and justice; having omitted many duties which we owe to him, having committed manifold offences against him; it is therefore most expedient that we first endeavor to get him reconciled to us, by the forgiveness of our debts and offences: concerning which remission, on what account it is necessary, on what terms it is granted, by what means it is obtained, in what manner it is dispensed by God, I have otherwhere touched, and it is not seasonable now farther to insist thereon; only it may be pertinent here to observe,

1. That this being the first of petitions (formally such, and) purely spiritual; we are hereby admonished to lay the foundation of our devotions in humility; that we are obliged, before we presume to ask any thing of God concerning our chief happiness and well-being, to reflect on, acknowlege, and confess our unworthiness, (not coming to our prayers as the Pharisee did, doting on our worthy qualities and good deeds; but like the poor publican, with a sense of our infirmities and miscarriages; so as to be ready to acknowlege ourselves, as indeed we all are, guilty of many and great sins;) this is here implied; for in requesting pardon for our sins, we confess ourselves to be sinners, and to need God's mercy.

2. We may hence learn the necessity and the excellency of that benefit we here beg. When the Psalmist applied himself to praise God for his benefits, this he set in the first place, as most needful and considerable to him; 'Bless the Lord, O my soul,' said he, 'and forget not all his benefits,' (or rather, not any of his benefits,) 'who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who

healeth all thy diseases;' and answerably, it is the first particular benefit we pray for.

3. We must take notice that we are obliged to go to our devotions with universal charity and good-will toward others; 'to lift up,' as St. Paul enjoineth, 'holy hands, without wrath and doubting,' (or 'without wrath and dissension,') to depose all enmity (as our Lord adviseth) before we bring our oblation to the altar of God; reserving no spite or grudge toward any man, but having a heart clear of all ill-will and desire of revenge; being in affection of mind toward others, as we do wish, and hope, and pray that God would be toward us: such in all reason, equity, and ingenuity should our disposition be; and such God requires it to be; and such we do assert and promise it to be; implying also a compact with God, no otherwise to desire or expect his favor and mercy toward us, than as we resemble him in kind and merciful intentions toward our brethren: it is implied on God's part, that he vouchsafes pardon only on these terms; yea more, that he doth truly promise pardon on our performing this condition; so our Saviour, purposely reflecting on this petition, doth afterward expound it; 'For,' saith he, 'if you forgive to men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you:' it also implies a consent on our parts, and submission to this condition, as most equal and reasonable; so that if we break it, if we do retain any uncharitable inclinations, we deal falsely with God; we forfeit all pretence to favor and mercy from him; we are neither qualified for mercy, nor shall obtain it from God.

Lead us not into Temptation.

TEMPTATION is sometime taken, in a middle and indifferent sense, for any occasion by which the moral quality of persons (their virtue or vice) is examined and discovered; so God is said to have tempted Abraham, when he propounded to him the offering up of his son; so he tempted the Israelites, by leading them in that long journey through the wilderness, 'that he might know what was in their heart, whether they would keep his commandments, or no:' so he likewise tempted them by permitting seducers to do wonderful things, 'that he might know whether they did love the Lord with all their heart and with all their soul:' and because affliction is of such a nature, as to try the temper, disposition, and intentions of men, therefore temptation often is used for affliction. It seemeth also sometimes put in a good sense, for an occasion designed to exercise, or to improve, or to declare the virtues of a person; so

the inconveniences and crosses incident to our nature and condition here, the which our Lord did undergo, are by St. Luke, and others of the Apostles, styled temptations; so the fiery trial, in St. Peter. was εἰς πειρασμὸν, to exercise and refine them, 'that,' saith he, 'the trial of their faith might be to praise, and honor, and glory;' so St. James biddeth Christians to 'rejoice, when they fall into divers temptations,' that is, when they meet with opportunities of exercising their faith and patience; and so we may understand that place in Deuteronomy; 'Who,' it is said, 'fed thee with manna, that he might humble and prove thee, (or tempt thee, ἵνα ἐκπειράσῃ σε, say the LXX.) to do thee good at thy latter end:' that he might tempt thee; that is, that he might render thee approved; might exercise and improve thy dependence on God, thy patience, thy obedience. But the word is commonly taken in a worse sense, for an occasion presented with ill purpose, or naturally tending and not easily avoided, of falling into sin; a stumblingblock, a snare; as when St. Paul saith, that 'they who will be rich, do fall εἰς πειρασμὸν καὶ παγίδα, into temptation and a snare;' thus St. James assureth us that 'God tempteth no man;' that is, doth not intend to seduce or inveigle any man into sin. Yet because nothing in the world, either good or bad, doth happen without God's permission and governance; and the Devil himself must obtain licence from God, before he can tempt any man, or do any mischief, (as we see in Job's case, and in the history of Ahab;) since God seeth whatever is done, and with greatest ease could hinder it; and doth not otherwise than for some good end suffer any evil to be designed or achieved; it is the style of Scripture to attribute such things in some sense to him; as when God is said to 'send Joseph into Egypt to preserve life;' whenas in truth his brethren, out of envy and ill-will, did sell him thither; and God is said to 'move David to number the people;' whenas indeed Satan (as it is otherwhere affirmed) 'provoked him to number them:' and that horrid tragedy acted by the Jews on our blessed Saviour is said to be brought to pass by the 'hand and definite counsel of God;' because God foreseeing the temptations which those men should incur of committing such acts, and their inclinations to perform them, did resolve not to interpose his power in hindrance of them, but suffering them to proceed, would turn their mischievous practices to an excellently good end, and use them as instruments of his just, holy, and gracious purposes: thus then, whereas by temptation here is meant any occasion alluring or provoking to sin, or withdrawing from duty, with a violence, all things considered, exceeding our strength to resist or avoid; (or how-

ever such an one that is apt to overthrow us;) God may be said to bring them into it, whom in justice he permits to be exposed thereto; although he do no otherwise intermeddle, or concur therein, than by not affording, or by withdrawing, his especial direction and assistance; leaving them without check blindly or wilfully to follow the sway of their own tempers, the instinct of their vain minds, the bent of their corrupt wills, the violence of their unruly passions and appetites; letting them to fall into the manifold snares of false opinion, evil custom, and contagious example, which the world sets before them; (the world, which by its fair promises and pleasing flatteries enticeth to sin, or by its angry frowns and fierce threats discourageth from goodness;) permitting the devil, without control or impediment, by his wiles to delude and seduce them; which kind of proceeding of God with men is clearly represented in the 81st Psalm; where, of the Israelites, God says, that having signally declared his pleasure to them, and by promise of great benefits invited them to observe it, on their wilful neglect, he dealt thus with them: 'But,' says God there, 'my people would not hearken to my voice, and Israel would none of me; so I gave them up unto their own hearts' lusts; and they walked in their own counsels.' In such manner, if God, provoked thereto by our heinous miscarriages, doth justly bring us into, or doth let us 'enter into temptation,' (as our Lord otherwhere expresseth it; 'Pray,' saith he, 'that ye enter not into temptation,') we shall infallibly run into many grievous sins and desperate mischiefs; no less surely, than we shall wander and stumble in the dark, than we shall slide and fall in the most slippery places, and sometimes be entangled, when we do walk in the midst of snares, surrounded with traps innumerable, most cunningly laid to catch us; 'It is not,' saith the prophet, 'in man to direct his steps,' so as to go straight and upright; it is not in him to see his duty, to bend his inclinations to compliance therewith; to restrain his appetites, when sensible objects forcibly press on them; to govern his passions, when they are vehemently stirred to disorderly motion; we do continually need God's instruction to guide us, God's hand to uphold us, God's care and help to guard us: when therefore, I say, our condition and circumstances do minister dangerous occasions of sin; when our vain and weak tempers do incline or betray us thereto; when the world would smile or frown us into it; when the Devil violently solicits, or thrusts on toward it; thus to be destitute of God's grace, thus to be left to ourselves, is the most horrible judgment that can be. In such cases and seasons God's interposal is necessary,

either to remove those temptations, or to support and defend us from the prevalence of them, φυλάσσων ἀπταίστους, 'keeping us from stumbling and falling,' as St. Jude speaks; 'not suffering us,' as St. Paul expresseth it, 'to be tempted above what we are able, but making with the temptation also a way to escape, so that we shall be able to sustain it.'

That God would please to do this for us, we do here pray; and in pursuance of this petition we subjoin that which in part may pass for an illustration thereof, (implying an antithesis serving to that purpose: for, 'delivering from evil' importeth the same with ῥύεσθαι ἐκ πειρασμοῦ, 'being rescued from temptation,' in St. Peter; 'The Lord,' saith he, 'knoweth how to rescue the godly out of temptation;' and τηρεῖν ἐκ τῆς ὥρας πειρασμοῦ, 'to preserve from the time of temptation,' in the Revelation; which are opposed to bringing into temptation,) partly it may be supposed an improvement thereof; delivering from evil signifying perhaps somewhat more than not permitting us to incur occasions strongly inviting us to evil; even the effectual keeping us from being overborne or complying with it. But let us consider that petition itself.

But deliver us from Evil.

'FROM evil,' ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ· St. Chrysostom takes it for the Devil; who is the ὁ πονηρὸς, the evil one, the tempter, who seduceth us to evil: but we shall take it according to the more common acception: 'from evil;' that is, principally, from sin, or evil moral and spiritual; the only evil, simply and in its own nature such, and the root of all other evil; from that, and consequently from all mischief (evil natural and temporal, or evil penal and afflictive) which may grow on or sprout from thence. As for such evils as these; the want of things necessary or convenient for us; bodily disease and pain; disappointment in our designs, and ill success in our undertakings; disgrace and reproach on our good names; dangers, difficulties, and distresses concerning our outward estate; distractions, vexations, and troubles of mind about temporal matters, with the like evils, (in some sense, in some degree evils, or appearing such to our natural sense and fancy;) we may indeed deprecate them, (as even our Lord himself did,) with submission (as he did) to the wisdom and will of God, in case it pleaseth him, and he thinketh fit to remove them; but all these things being but names and empty sounds in comparison to spiritual and eternal evils, (such as are vicious distempers of mind; indispositions to serve God; ill progress in our spiritual affairs; dissatisfaction con-

cerning our state in respect to God; actual transgression of God's holy will and law; incurring God's displeasure and disfavor; being deprived of his grace and assistance; wanting the communion and comfort of his Holy Spirit; remorse of conscience, and anguish of spirit for having violated or neglected our duty; blindness of mind, hardness of heart; want of love, reverence, devotion toward God, of charity and good-will toward our neighbor; of sobriety, humility, regularity of passion, and calmness of temper, in respect to ourselves and the inward frame of our souls; these, I say, and such like evils,) we should absolutely request of God, that he in mercy would deliver and free us from them; they being irreconcilably repugnant to his will and glory, and inconsistent with our eternal welfare. Yet even these, and all other things, we do request only in general terms, leaving the distinct matter, and manner, and measure, according to which they should be dispensed, to the wisdom and goodness of God; who doth, as our Lord telleth us, 'know what things we have need of, before we ask him;' and is not only able, as St. Paul says, but willing also, to do for us superabundantly above what we can ask or think. We are hereby (it seems) taught this point of good manners in our devotion, not to be tediously punctual and particular in our prayers, as if God needed our information, or were apt to neglect the particulars concerning our good.

We shut up all with a doxology, most suitable to the nature of devotion, signifying our due faith, our affection, and our reverence toward God.

For thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

THAT is, for thou hast a perpetual and unmovable authority, whereby justly to dispose of all things; thou hast an indefectible and irresistible power, whereby thou canst effect whatever seems just and good to thee; wherefore we profess only to rely on, and seek help from thee; with hope and confidence we address ourselves to thee for the supply of our needs: 'thine is the glory;' all honor and reverence, all love and thankfulness are due unto thee; therefore we render our adorations and acknowlegements to thee. Even so to thee, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, be for ever ascribed all glory and praise. Amen.

SUMMARY OF AN

EXPOSITION ON THE DECALOGUE.

PREVIOUS observations on the design, political and moral, of this system of precepts. Considerations on the *manner* of its delivery; on the *matter* of it; on the end and design of its precepts; on our Saviour's not derogating from its law; on its containing no commandment that does not concern us; on its containing all or greatest part of our duties. Particulars discussed.

I. *God spake all these words,* saying, *God spake,* that is, God Almighty is its author, &c. *All these words,* that is, these speeches, sentences, or matters. *All,* without exception, come from the same authority.

I am the Lord, or I am *Jehovah,* &c. *Thy God,* as bearing a special reference to thee, above all people, &c.

Who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, &c. This explained and shown to be applicable in a spiritual sense unto us.

Thou shalt have no other gods but me. Some render the Hebrew, *no strange gods.* The prohibition explained. The great unreasonableness, indecency, and injustice of having such, dilated on.

II. *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image,* &c. As the first commandment determined the final object of our religion, this limits the manner of exercising and expressing it. Observations on the origin of idolatry, &c. Impossibility of our devising any resemblance which is not infinitely beneath and unworthy of God. This law confirmed in the New Testament. Common consent and tradition of the ancient Church is against

worshipping of images; opinions of the Fathers. Consideration of what is implied and intended by this positive precept. Presumption of those whose practices offend against it. Two commandments subjoined; though others have accounted them as one: observations on this point.

For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God: this commented on critically. Meaning of *a jealous God* explained.

Visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children, &c. Meaning of this explained so as not to derogate from God's mercy and justice. *Of them that hate me:* meaning of this.

Showing mercy unto thousands, &c. Meaning of the expression *showing mercy:* also that of *loving God,* &c.

III. *Thou shalt not take the name,* &c. This commandment consists of a *precept,* and a *reason,* deterring us from disobedience. The precept explained. The immediate nature of swearing: extended sense of the same.

IV. *Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,* &c. Particular relation of this to the Jewish nation considered. Reasons of its institution. Its application to ourselves.

V. *Honor thy father and thy mother.* Meaning of the word *honor* considered. High obligation of this duty. Various reasons for our observance of it stated. Title of *Father* adopted by God himself. Good of the world connected with the performance of this command.

Promise annexed to this command: *that thy days,* &c. Nature of this promise. A contrary curse implied on the infringers of this law. Appropriateness of the reward proposed. Extension of this law to all who stand in certain relations to us, &c.

VI. *Thou shalt not kill.* Life the most precious of all things we possess. The disposal of it is left to God alone. Instances where he delegates his authority to others. Crime of murder explained and dilated on. A positive duty also implied in this precept, that we are bound, as far as in us lies, to preserve our neighbor's life, &c. The peculiar enormity of murder commented on.

VII. *Thou shalt not commit adultery.* After life, nothing is more dear to men than the comforts of the conjugal estate, &c. Enormity of violating this sacred institution dilated on,

as respects God, our neighbor, ourselves, and the public. Extension of this law to lower acts of transgression.

VIII. *Thou shalt not steal.* Cogent reasons stated for the inviolability of property. Nature of the crime of stealing dilated on. Extension of the law to minor offences. Positive duties of industry, contentment, charity, &c. connected with it.

IX. *Thou shalt not bear false witness,* &c. Primary nature of this prohibition, according to the Hebrew. Extension of it to the prejudicing our neighbor's reputation, &c. Illustrations from Scripture. Our obligations to candor, sincerity, &c. reduced to this law.

X. *Thou shalt not covet,* &c. This law is comprehensive, and recapitulatory, as it were, of the rest, which concern our neighbor. Necessity of watching the desires of the heart. Spirituality of God's law. Concluding observations on the two great commandments.

AN

EXPOSITION OF THE DECALOGUE.

ALTHOUGH this system of precepts may seem to have been in its design rather political than moral; to regard public and external, rather than private and interior action; that great branch of morality, which respecteth ourselves in our private retirements, or in our particular conversation, sobriety of mind and manners, being scarce touched herein, at least not openly and plainly expressed; as also devotion toward God, (in any of its kinds, of praise, thanksgiving, confession of sin, prayer and intercession,) that great part of natural religion, being not explicitly and positively enjoined: although also (as by the introduction thereto, and some passages therein, especially as it is delivered in Deuteronomy, may appear) it seemeth particularly to concern the Jewish nation; a people called and chosen by God out of all nations, to be governed in a more special and immediate manner by God himself, obliged to him by peculiar benefits and favors, designed by him to a separate manner of living; being also perhaps in temper and disposition, as well as in condition and circumstances of life, different from other people; whence laws convenient (or in a manner necessary) for them might not so well suit to all others; on which accounts, as other of their laws, so perchance some passages in this notable part of them, may not unreasonably be deemed peculiarly to concern them; although however this system doth more directly and immediately oblige that people, all being formally, and in style of law, directed only to them, promulged in their ears, expressed in their language, inserted into the body of their laws, as a principal member of them; it being also expressly called a covenant with that people, ('He declared unto you,' says the text, 'his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments,') and accordingly was reposed in the ark, hence it seems named 'the ark of the covenant,' the which, when all nations should be

converted to God, and admitted into the church, was, as the prophet Jeremiah foretold, to be utterly discarded and laid aside; ('In those days,' saith God in him, 'they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the Lord: neither shall it come to mind: neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall that be done any more.') Hence, although some passages herein, according to their primary, strict, and literal meaning, might never have been intended universally and perpetually to oblige;

Yet, notwithstanding these exceptions, if we consider,

1. The manner of its delivery; with what extraordinary solemnity it was proclaimed; how it was dictated immediately from God's own mouth; and written with his finger; or,

2. The matter of it, containing the prime dictates of natural reason, the chief rules of piety toward God, and equity toward our neighbor; (whence those elogies conferred on it in Nehemiah; 'Thou camest also down on mount Sinai—and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments:' and by St. Paul: 'The law is holy; the commandment holy, just, and good:' for that commendation doth, I suppose, especially respect this part of the Jewish law, out of which he takes his instance, 'Thou shalt not covet:') if we also consider,

3. The end and design of these precepts, which was to ground them in true notions of religion, and to dispose them to the practice of righteousness; to render them loyal and acceptable subjects to God; to promote God's glory and their own good; which being expressed in general concerning their law, doth more especially agree to this system; being as the base and platform, the heart and quintessence of all their other laws; the which seem added as superstructures on it, or fences thereof.

4. If we also consider that our Saviour did not derogate from this law, but declared his intention only to expound it, or to ampliate and extend it; (they are the words of Tertullian and Irenæus;) and how the Apostles do sometimes allege some passages in it, as retaining some authority and force to oblige.

5. Considering also, farther, that there is no commandment herein (howsoever according to its immediate and direct sense seeming peculiar to that people) which may not in a larger, or in a mysterious and spiritual meaning, which at least may not according to good analogy, or parity of reason, concern us; obliging us, if not by direct authority in punctual manner to the very same thing, yet, as a signification of God's

pleasure and approbation, to somewhat answerable and like thereto.

6. Lastly, if we consider that all or the greatest part of the main duties concerning us are either plainly expressed, or closely insinuated in them; or may at least be conveniently reduced to them; our Saviour himself having gone before, directing us in the matter and manner of doing it:

Considering, I say, these things, we have no small reason to yield great veneration to this ancient system of precepts; and to acknowlege the great use thereof in order to the guidance of our life and practice: we accordingly shall so descant thereon, as by considering the main drift, intrinsic reason, and spiritual intention of each particular, to reduce the chief precepts of Christian doctrine which oblige us thereto.

Premising thus much, I address my discourse to the particulars; omitting all controverted niceties concerning the division thereof, and all circumstantial questions; touching only such things as shall appear substantial and useful.

God spake all these Words, saying:

THIS is a title or superscription, like the *Par de le Roi* ('by the King') at the head of a proclamation, declaring from whom, and in what manner, that which follows doth come; and therefore implying what it is, and how it should be received.

God spake; It comes from God, as author; and that most immediately, as it were, from his own mouth; and hath consequently the nature and force of a law, obliging to highest regard and obedience; as that which proceedeth from the most sovereign, unquestionable, and uncontrollable authority; which is promulged in a way most evident and most direct: every signification of God's purpose or pleasure is usually called God's word; 'for God,' as the Apostle says, 'in divers kinds and manners did speak unto the fathers;' and to every such word our ear should be attentive, our heart should be submissive, our hand should be obedient; but especially they should be so when God himself immediately declares his mind and will; as he did notoriously in this case, by a great voice, distinctly audible and intelligible, miraculously formed by himself; 'Behold,' say the people, 'the Lord our God hath showed us his glory and his greatness, and we have heard his voice out of the midst of the fire: we have seen this day that

God doth talk with man, and he liveth:' and if whatever is in God's name (by message of angels, by inspiration of men, or by any other ways) revealed, must be entertained with all submiss respect, what regard is due to that word, which God is pleased, not by his ministers and instruments, but himself in person, as it were, to pronounce!

These words: that is, these speeches, or sentences; (for so a word in Scripture style signifieth;) or these things and matters; (for the Hebrew word *debarim*, as the Greek ῥήματα, signifieth both words and things:) they are several times in the Pentateuch called the ten words or ten things: whence the system of them is named the Decalogue.

'All these words:' all, without distinction or exception, did proceed from the same authority, and in the same manner; and all therefore do require the like regard and observance to be yielded to them.

I am the Lord; or, *I am Jehovah, thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt:*

THESE words are by some taken for a precept, enjoining the acknowlegement and acceptance of God, answerable to what is here implied; and consequently all the positive duties of religion, deducible hence: but we see the style is declarative and assertive, not directly imperative; and so it may pass rather as a preface, farther enforcing obligation to obedience; wherein are expressed or intimated the chief reasons on which it is grounded; every word containing in it somewhat of remarkable emphasis.

'I am Jehovah;' or that very same God, who under this appellation discovered myself to thy forefathers; who enacted a special covenant with them; who received homage, worship, and engagements to service from them; who promised especial protection and favor to them and to their seed; that Jehovah, who indeed am, what this name importeth, the only true and real God; eternal, independent, and indefectible in essence; true and infallible in word; constant and immutable in purpose; firm and faithful in performance of whatever I promise or threaten: that same Jehovah I am: to whose words therefore, on all accounts of reason, of duty, of interest, thou particularly dost owe most submissive attention and obedience.

'Thy God:' that supereminent Being and Power, to whom thou peculiarly dost owe worship and honor, love and affection, duty and service: who although he be indeed the Lord of all the world, yet beareth a special relation unto thee; as

having chosen and avouched 'thee to be a special people to himself, above all the people that are on the face of the earth;' having promised thee to 'make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honor;' and having by many signal demonstrations of favor and mercy confirmed to thee the performance of his covenant and promise; thou also reciprocally having 'avowed me to be thy God, to walk in my ways, to keep my statutes, my commandments, my judgments, and to hearken to my voice.'

Who brought thee out of the Land of Egypt; out of the House of Bondage:

THIS is a particular and most remarkable instance, by which it appeareth what God it is that doth thus impose law on them, and how they are obliged to entertain it: that God it is, who in pursuance of his singular favor toward thee, and of his covenant made with thee, hath particularly obliged thee by so eminent a benefit, in a manner so full of wonder in itself, so full of grace toward thee, delivering thee from saddest oppression and slavery, bringing thee into a desirable state of present liberty, and of sure tendency (not otherwise than by thy fault to be frustrated) toward enjoyment of rest, of plenty, of all joy and comfort in the promised land; declaring hereby, as his glorious and divine perfections of wisdom and power, so his exceeding goodness toward thee, his faithful care over thee, his readiness and sufficiency, in all thy needs and exigences, to protect, preserve, and deliver thee:

I then being such, Jehovah, the only true God; thy God, by particular engagement and endearment; thy gracious and bountiful benefactor, not in will only, but in deed, do thus propound my will unto thee; and on all accounts of general and special duty, of reason, of justice, of gratitude, require thy regard and observance of what follows.

Now what God in a direct and literal sense thus speaketh to the Jewish people, may, according to likeness of case and parity of reason, (especially in a mystical and spiritual way,) on more considerable and effectual accounts, be applied unto us: the Lord Jehovah is such no less to us than to them; he is 'the same yesterday, to day, and for ever;' to him, as to the only true, eternal, and Almighty God, the essential Author, Lord, and Governor of all things, our highest respect and observance are due; he also, in a stricter relation, founded on higher grounds, is our God, having chosen us, and consecrated us more especially to himself; having received us into a closer confede-

racy, ('a new and better covenant,' as the Apostle calls it, 'established on better promises;') having obliged us by granting nobler privileges, and dispensing more excellent benefits to us: who likewise hath brought us up out of a spiritual Egypt, and state of infinitely more wretched bondage; hath rescued us from the tyrannical dominion of Satan, (a far more intolerably cruel and hard master than any Pharoah;) hath freed us from serving sin in our souls and bodies, a far harder service than making bricks, or any bodily toil can be; who hath conducted us in the way, and conferred on us an assured hope, (if we be not wanting to ourselves and our duty,) of entering into the heavenly Canaan, a place of perfect rest and unconceivable bliss; who, as St. Paul expresseth it, 'hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of his most beloved Son:' who therefore here, according to spiritual intent, may be understood to speak in a higher strain to us; justly exacting a more punctual and accurate obedience to his commandments. But so much for that part which seems introductory.

Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.

It is in the Hebrew, There shall be to thee no other gods (or no strange gods; for *alii* some render it, some *alieni*,) על פני (*al pani*) to my face, or at my face; that is, in comparison, or competition with me; so as to be confronted to me; or together and in consort with me: 'I am he,' said God otherwhere, 'and there is no God עמדי (*immadhi*) with me,' or beside me; πλὴν ἐμοῦ, the LXX. render it; and so the phrase commonly importeth; as in that saying of the Scribe, answering to this; 'There is one God, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ, and there is no other God beside him:' but we need not criticise on the words, the sense being plain; as containing a prohibition of assuming any other into partnership with the one true God; acknowleging, in mind or in outward expression, any other for God. The precept, as most of the rest, is in form negative and prohibitive, but supposeth and implieth somewhat affirmative and positive; as the rest also may be conceived to do: it implies this affirmative precept, Thou shalt have me for thy God. Now to have for our God, signifies, as to internal disposition of mind, a most high esteem, honor, dread, and love of that Being, as endued with attributes and perfections superlatively excellent; the admiring all his works, approving all his actions, acquiescing in all his proceedings and dealings with us; the reposing our hope and trust in him, as most able and

willing to help us, and do us good: in outward expression, to acknowlege, praise, and bless him as such; to yield all fitting demonstrations of respect to his name, and to whatever is specially related to him; patiently to submit to his will, and readily to obey his commandments: these principally and the like acts of internal devotion and external piety are comprised in the words, 'having him for our God,' and we are to understand them here enjoined to us; the same which is in Scripture called the fearing, the serving, the worshipping, the loving God with all our heart, and all our soul, and all our mind, and all our might.

This is implied: and it is expressly prohibited us to yield to any other beside him the like esteem, acknowlegement, or service. That there is in truth but one such being, to whom eminently those acts are due, nature, ancient tradition, general consent, and especially divine revelation, do assure us; whereon is consequent, that yielding them (yielding, I say, those opinions, estimations, and affections of our mind, or those acknowlegements and expressions in word, or those performances in deed or work, which we before specified) to any other being whatever, whether really existent in the world, or merely formed by our imagination, is highly unreasonable, unbeseeming us, and unjust toward him.

1. It is highly unreasonable, as false and groundless in itself, as vain and unprofitable to us, as productive of many bad effects. It is from error in a matter of the highest nature and mainest consequence; and so beyond any other mistake hurtful to us, as reasonable and intelligent creatures; the *μετάλλαξις τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει*, 'the transmuting the truth of God into a lie,' St. Paul calls it; reckoning it for a grievous folly and crime. It is a vanity of all most lamentable; a pursuance of shadows, an embracing of clouds; a building in air, or mere vacuity; a leaning on that which hath no substance, or no strength to support us; a dreaming and doting on mere nothing; whence those false deities well in Scripture are termed *μάταια*, vanities; for that, as they have no truth, or substance, or efficacy considerable in them, so all our thoughts, affections, expectations, and labors are idly misemployed, and unprofitably mispent on them.

2. It is also a thing most unbeseeming us men, (whom God hath placed in so high a rank of worth and dignity among his creatures; who are in our original so near of kin, so like in nature, so dear in relation and regard unto God himself,) to admire and worship, to place our choice affections on, to afford lowly submissions unto, to rest our hope and confidence in,

any other but him, who alone truly so far excels us, and can worthily challenge such respects from us: all flattery is base and unworthy; but this of all is the worst and most unbecoming.

3. To do so is most unjust and injurious to God; to whom, as to the Author of our being, and of all our good received since, we do owe all that our mind can yield of reverence, all that our heart can hold of affection, all that our tongue can utter of praise, all that our utmost might can perform of service: and since the exhibiting to any other thing part of these must needs not only by that communication debase and derogate from their worth, but also withdraw them in great measure from him, so diminishing and embezzling his due, (for we cannot, as our Saviour teacheth us, together adhere unto, or serve, divers masters;) therefore having any other God but the true one, is a high indignity and a heinous injury to him.

This command therefore is most reasonable on many accounts; which as it hath been in grossest manner violated by those who have not acknowleged or worshipped any God at all, and by those who have acknowleged and adored many gods, (by all atheists and polytheists;) from which transgressions thereof we Christians may seem totally exempt, who in formal profession and practice have but one God, (the Maker and Lord of all things, infinitely perfect and glorious;) yet there are many subtle, and, perchance, no less mischievous transgressions thereof, of which even we may be very guilty, and to which we are very obnoxious. If we do not with all our hearts reverence and love the most wise and powerful, the most just and holy, the most good and gracious God; if we do not trust and hope in him, as the fountain of all our good; if we do not diligently worship and praise him; if we do not humbly submit to his will and obey his laws, we break the positive intent of this law, not having him for our God; being indeed like those of whom St. Paul speaketh, 'who profess to know God,' (that is, who in words and outward pretence acknowlege him,) 'but in works deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and to every good work reprobate.' Likewise, if we frame in our fancy an idea untrue, disagreeable unto, or unworthy of, that one most excellent Being, and to such a phantasm of our own creation do yield our highest respects and best affections, we break this law, and have another God to ourselves. If on any creature (whether ourselves or any other thing) we impart our chief esteem or affection, or employ our most earnest care and endeavor, or chiefly rely on it, or most delight in it, that thing we make a god unto us, and are

guilty of breaking this law. Hence St. Paul more than once calls the covetous (or wrongful) person an idolater; and our Lord calls the immoderate pursuit of riches, the serving (or worshipping) of Mammon; and St. Paul speaketh of some persons who were φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι, 'lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God;' of whom otherwhere he says, 'that their god was their belly:' we meet with those in the Scripture, who 'put their trusts in their horses and their chariots;' with those, who 'sacrifice to their net, and burn incense to their drag;' with them, who 'trust in man, and make flesh their arm;' (men of Mezentius's faith, ready to say with him, *Dextra mihi Deus est, et telum quod missile libro;*) with those, 'whose heart is lifted up,' (as the prince of Tyre in Ezekiel,) and who 'say they are gods:' these, and whoever practise in like manner, are so many transgressors of this covenant: in short, whoever chiefly regards and affects, seeks and pursues, confides and delights in wealth, or honor, or pleasure; wit, wisdom, strength, or beauty; himself, friends, or any other creature, he hath another God, against the design and meaning of this holy law.

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven Image, &c.

THE first commandment determined the final object of our religion; this doth limit the manner of exercising and expressing it; as to the chief intent of it, interdicting that mode, which in the practice of ancient times had so generally prevailed, of representing the deities (apprehended so) in some corporeal shape, and thereto yielding such expressions of respect, as they conceived suitable and acceptable to such deities. I cannot stand to declare the rise and progress of such a practice; how the Devil's malice, and some men's fraud conspiring with other men's superstitious ignorance and fondness, prevailed so far to impose on mankind; I shall only observe that men naturally are very prone to comply with suggestions to such guises of religion: for as the sense of want, and pain, and manifold inconvenience, not to be removed or remedied by any present sensible means, doth prompt men to wish and seek for help from otherwhere; and this disposes them to entertain any hopes propounded to them (with how little soever ground of probability) of receiving it from any absent or invisible power; as it also consequently engageth them to undertake any conditions required by those who propound such hopes, as needful for obtaining thereof; whence the ordinary sort of men are very apt to embrace any way of religion suggested to them, espe-

cially by persons of credit, and authority for knowlege; so also, when the proposition thereof doth come attended with circumstantial appearances, and shows, gratifying their senses, or humoring their passions, or delightfully amusing their fancies, it most easily allures and takes them; as likewise, on the other side, when abstraction of mind and restraint of passion are required, and sense or fancy are little entertained thereby, men are somewhat averse from such proposals of religion, and are not so easily brought heartily to like, or earnestly to embrace them: wherefore since the propounding of images and sensible representations, (relating to somewhat not immediately discerned, from whence men are promised the supply of their needs, or relief from the inconveniences which they endure,) by their magnificency, beauty, curiosity, strangeness, or even by their sensibility itself, do make so facile and pleasant impressions on the dull and low conceits of men, it is the less wonderful that men commonly have been so easily inveigled into such idolatrous superstitions, so unreasonable in themselves, and of so mischievous consequence. For what can be more senseless than to imagine that that Being, which in wisdom and power is sufficient to overrule nature, and thereby to afford us the assistance we need, may be resembled by any of these corporeal things, the best of which we cannot, without debasing ourselves, esteem superior to ourselves? how unreasonable is it to conceit thus, how unworthy is it, and unsuitable to the dignity of our nature, derived from heaven, to crouch unto such mean representations! It is St. Paul's discourse; 'Being,' saith he, 'the offspring of God, we ought not to think, that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.' How injurious also to that most excellent nature must it be to frame, and expose to view, such, not only homely and mean, but, in respect of the divine nature, most foul and ugly, portraitures of him, which cannot but tend to vilify him in men's conceit! He that should form the image of a serpent, or a toad, and exhibit it as the similitude of a king, would surely derogate much from his majesty, and beget very mean and unbeseeming conceits of his person in their minds whom he should persuade to take it for such; and infinitely more must he detract from the dignity, and diminish the reverence due to that immense, almighty, all-wise, most pure and perfect Being, who shall presume to present any sensible, any finite, any corruptible thing, as a resemblance of him; 'changing,' as St. Paul expresseth it, 'the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things;' as the Israelites are

said to have 'changed their glory (that is, their glorious God) into the similitude of an ox, that eateth grass:' no wonder it was, that they, who used such expressions of their religion, had so low opinions concerning those supposed deities whom they worshipped; that they supposed them liable to such passions, fathered such actions on them, described them as vile in their dispositions and their doings, as they represented them in their shape: most reasonable therefore is this prohibition of making any resemblance, of what kind soever, (by picture, sculpture, or fusion,) in order to religious adoration; and yielding to them any such signification of respect, which the custom or consent of men hath appropriated to religion; as bowing, falling down, lying prostrate before them, or the like: most reasonable, I say; for since there is but one proper and allowable object of our worship, as the first commandment declares and enacts, the making an image of any other existent in nature, or devised by our own fancy in order to the worship thereof, is but a pursuance of that unreasonable, unhandsome, and unjust superstition there forbidden; adding some absurdity in the manner to the pravity in the substance of such worship.

And as for that one true object of our devotion, the eternal, immense, and all-perfect God; the glorious excellency of whose nature doth infinitely transcend our comprehension, and consequently of whom we cannot devise any resemblance not infinitely beneath him, unlike to him, unworthy of him; (whereby we shall not disparage him, and expose him to irreverent apprehensions, especially with the gross vulgar; whereby indeed we shall not cloud his true, inimitable perfections, and affix imperfections to him; blending inexpressible truth with apparent falsehood;) it must be therefore a profane folly to pretend the representing him by any image; and the doing of it is on such accounts in many places of Scripture forbidden; and that it is so here, according to the intent of this precept, is plain by that place in Deuteronomy, where Moses reports the ground of this prohibition; 'Take ye therefore,' saith he, 'good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of fire; lest you corrupt, and make you a graven image:' no shape representing God did appear at his utterance of these laws, to prevent their framing any resemblance of God, and taking occasion to practise this sort of worship, thereby implied to be unreasonable. And the prophet Isaiah having in sublime language and discourse set out the incomparable greatness, power, and majesty of God; ('Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with a

span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance; before whom the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of a balance; yea, before whom all nations are as nothing, and are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity; who sitteth on the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; who stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in;') having, I say, in this, and more such language, endeavored to describe the might and majesty of God, he infers; 'To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?' and thereon he proceeds to discourse against making images for religious use. Like whereto is the discourse of St. Paul to the Athenians; 'God,' saith he, 'who made the world and all things that are therein, being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; nor is worshipped by the hands of men: we therefore being the offspring of God, ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, the engravement of art and man's device:' in which place, as the forming any image to represent divine things is manifestly prohibited, so the reasons which we touched against such practice are discernibly enough insinuated.

Neither should we omit that this law is confirmed in the New Testament, and there made a part of God's new law: for we are therein often commanded to flee idols, not to be idolaters, to shun idolatry as a most heinous crime, of the highest rank, proceeding from fleshly pravity, inconsistent with good conscience, and exposing to damnation: for the meaning and notion of idolatry in which places, why should we understand it otherwise than according to the plain sense of the word, which is the worship of images, or resemblances? why should we take it otherwise than as opposite to God's law, then in force? why should we otherwise expound it than according to the common notion and acceptance of God's people at that time? The word idolatry was unknown to other people than the Jews: among the Jews it signified the violation of the second commandment: wherefore the observance of that commandment is established and enforced by the Apostles. The Jews detested the worshipping any images: their detestation was grounded on this law: they therefore, who earnestly exhort them to continue in detestation thereof, do confirm and enforce the obligation of this law: nor can we reasonably suppose any distinction, or reservation for any idolatry, (or any worshipping of images,) as lawful or allowable to Christians;

since the Apostles, as they found it universally prohibited to the Jews, so they continued to charge Christians against it. This discourse hath more force, considering that the same reason on which this law was enacted doth still apparently continue; men still unmeasurably affecting this fanciful way of religion, being apt in the exercise thereof (if not curbed by a law) to dote on sensible representations; being averse from raising up their minds to the only true object of worship, as endued with intelligible and spiritual perfections: this the experience of men's wild eagerness for images, reliques, and other such foolish trinkets, which had almost quite oppressed our religion, (as in many ages the best and wisest men did observe and complain,) doth plainly evince.

We may add, that if the common tradition and consent of the ancient Church is in any case a ground of persuasion, or rule of practice to us, we are thence obliged to disapprove and decline the worshipping images; for nothing can be more evident than that all such worship was not only carefully eschewed, but zealously detested, by the primitive Christians: this is manifest from most express words of the Fathers generally impugning and condemning all worship of images; which are as applicable to that worship which hath been practised among Christians, as to that of the heathens; their expressions do not signify, nor their arguments prove, any thing, if any worship of images be allowable; if they do not as well condemn and confute the modern, as the ancient Romans; they could not with any reason or modesty have used such words, or urged such reasons, if their practice had been like that which afterward crept into the Church; their darts then against Pagan idolatry easily might, surely would, have been retorted on themselves; which is so far from having been done, that the Pagans accused them for having no images; ('Celsus objecteth,' saith Origen, 'that we shun making altars, statues, and shrines, thinking this to be a faithful pledge (or mark) of our secret communion together:' this Origen answers by confessing the matter of fact, but defending the right: Not for your reason, saith he, we shun these things, but 'because we by the doctrine of Jesus, having found the true manner of piety toward God, do eschew those things which in conceit or appearance of piety do make men impious'—and 'the images of Christians are,' saith he, 'their virtues, whereby they resemble God, and truly worship him; and every good Christian, carefully imitating God, is his best statue.'

Yea, the Fathers were so far from practising worship of images, that some of them condemn the simple making of them;

calling the art of doing it a fallacious art, introduced by the Devil, and forbidden by God; expounding this commandment so, as that in it not only the worshipping, but the forming any similitude is forbidden? 'Moses,' saith Clemens Alexandrinus, 'did of old expressly give law, that no carved, or fusile, or plastered, or painted portraiture, or imagery should be made; that we should not attend to sensible things, but pass to things intelligible:' and Tertullian in several places saith the same. Whether their exposition (concurring, it seems, with the common opinion of the Jews in their time) were true, I shall not now discuss; that making any similitudes in order to worship is prohibited, is most evident.

In fine, divers of the Fathers say that all the commands in the Decalogue, excepting the Sabbath, do continue in force, as naturally obligatory, and as confirmed by the Christian law: for instance, St. Augustine, in his 119th Epistle, speaketh thus: 'The other precepts (excepting the sabbath) there (in the Decalogue) we do observe properly, as they are commanded, without any figurate observation; for we have manifestly learned not to worship idols, and not to take the name of the Lord our God in vain, to honor father and mother, &c. do not figurately pretend one thing and mystically signify another thing, but are so observed as they sound.'

But so much for the prohibition: I shall add, that we may conceive this positive precept implied and intended here; That in our devotions and religious services of God, we should raise our mind above gross sense and fancy; that we should entertain high and worthy conceptions of God; that we should apprehend him incomparably superior to all things which we do see or know; that we direct our minds unto him as to a Being transcendently perfect in goodness, justice, wisdom, and power, above what we can comprehend and think: that which our Saviour calls 'worshipping God in spirit and truth;' which is (as I take it) the special positive duty of this commandment.

I need not farther to urge how presumptuous and dangerous the practices of those men are, who, (to the great danger and scandal of Christianity among Jews and Mahometans, and men of other religions,) notwithstanding these commandments of God, backed with others of the same import, frequently occurring in the holy Scripture, (never, that we find any intimation of, repealed or relaxed,) particularly against that signal one made use of by our Saviour, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve;' without any ancient good authority or example, without any necessity or good rea-

son inducing, do not only yield themselves, but violently force others to yield unto angels, and unto the souls of dead men, (men of dubious state in reference to God, not having passed the last trial and judgment, the result whereof it is a profane temerity in us peremptorily to anticipate,) all kinds of worship, both internal (reposing trust and hope in them of obtaining benefits from them; attributing unto them in their esteem the knowlege and power which, for all that we can know, are incommunicably proper unto God himself) and external, of prayer and invocation, of praise and thanksgiving: and not only thus, as to the substance, imparting a kind of divine worship to them, but, as to the manner, erecting images of them, even in the places devoted to God's own service, and affording to them the same expressions of reverence and respect, that we do or can present unto God himself, (with great solemnity dedicating such images to them, with huge care and cost decking them, with great semblance of devotion saluting them, and casting themselves down before them; carrying them in procession, exposing them to the people, and making long pilgrimages to them;) so that instead of the spiritual worship of God himself, peculiarly required of Christians, and to which our religion is perfectly suited; a religion chiefly employing sense and fancy, and for the greatest part directed unto the representations of creatures, is substituted, in despite, as it were, and in defiance of these commandments; the plain force of which they endeavor to elude and evade by slender pretences and subtle distinctions, by the like to which there is no law which may not as easily be rendered insignificant and invalid: never in the mean time considering that these laws were not given to employ the wits of sophisters and schoolmen, but to direct the practice of rude and plain people; to which purpose no law, after such artists have had the handling of it, can signify any thing; nothing being so clear, which by their cavillations and quirks they cannot confound; nothing so smooth, wherein they cannot find or make knots.

There is subjoined to these two commandments (as we reckon them; others have accounted them but one; and their opinion is somewhat countenanced by what is added here seeming to bear a common respect to both; there is, I say, subjoined) a reason, or rather a contexture of reasons, strongly pressing and encouraging to obedience, deterring and discouraging from disobedience to them, or indeed generally to all God's commandments, but especially unto these, most immediately relating to him:

For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God; (am *El kanah, fortis zelotes*, as the Vulgar Latin reads it: it may seem to have been a name of God, implying, as all the other names of God do, some attribute of God; for it is in the 34th of Exodus said, *Thou shalt worship no other God: for the Lord, whose name is Jealous*, or *Kana, is a jealous God;*)

'I AM a jealous God;' that is, a God very tender of my honor, and of my right; who am impatient of any mate, or competitor, in respect to those duties which properly and incommunicably belong unto me; 'I am,' saith God in the Prophet Isaiah, 'the Lord; that is my name, and my glory I will not give to another, nor my praise to graven images.' This jealousy doth contain in it, not only a strong dislike, but a fierce displeasure against the infringers of these laws; 'For the Lord thy God' (saith Moses in Deuteronomy, pressing the observance of this same precept, concerning the worship of images) 'is a consuming fire, he is a jealous God:' and if God be thus jealous, so easily provoked to indignation by our detracting his due honor, and imparting it to any other, we have great reason to be afraid of incurring the guilt of either; for 'who can stand in his sight, when he is angry?' who can support the effects of his displeasure?

Visiting the iniquity of the Fathers on the Children, unto the third and fourth Generation of them that hate me;

'VISITING the iniquities of fathers on the children:' God doth not only punish those persons themselves, who commit notorious and heinous sins, (such as these of idolatry and profaneness, whereby he is publicly wronged and dishonored) but the more to deter men, (who naturally bear much regard to their posterity, and are afraid to be, ashamed to appear, the causes of ruin and calamity to their family,) he declareth that in respect to their doings it shall go ill with their posterity; they shall therefore be more strictly and severely dealt with; they shall on this score be capable of less favor and mercy from God, than otherwise they might have been: for we must not hereby understand that God will arbitrarily inflict undeserved pains on the children of bad men for the faults of their ancestors, (God doth expressly disclaim such kind of proceeding; 'The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father; the soul that sinneth it shall die;' saith he in the Prophet: and,

'Every one shall die for his own iniquity;' 'Every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge,') but that he will on that account withdraw his free favors from them; that measure of grace and indulgence, which otherwise the son of such a person (had he not been a great traitor against God) might, according to the general course of God's goodness, have received, the which might have more effectually restrained him from sin, and consequently have prevented his guilt and his punishment, God may well (in consistence with his justice and goodness, to manifest his detestation of heinous wickedness) withhold from him. Such a son, if he do fall into personal offences, (for that also is to be understood; otherwise, such is the goodness of God, that he hath declared, 'if a son seeing his father's sins, and considering, doeth not the like, he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, but shall surely live;' if, I say, he falleth into personal sins,) God will visit; that is, will use a close inspection and animadversion on him, will severely punish and avenge his sin; not only on his own, but on his father's account; examples of which proceeding do in the divine histories frequently occur; in Solomon, in Jeroboam, in Baasha, in Ahab, in Jehu, and in others.

Of them that hate me. We may observe that in the Scripture style the transgressors of God's laws are termed haters and enemies of God; because their actions signify a disposition of mind in them repugnant to the mind of God; and because by them they resist and oppose God's will: no wonder then if God deal thus severely with them.

But God not only deters from disobedience by threatening a train of punishments, but he encourageth to obedience by a declaration of his intention, (or promise,) graciously to reward, not only on the obedient persons themselves, but on their posterity for ever, (in a manner,) unto thousands, that is, unto a thousand descents:

Showing Mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

'SHOWING mercy:' God doth not absolutely promise that he will forbear to punish the posterity of good men, in case they offend, but that he will show mercy, and deal the more favorably with them in that respect: his meaning and method in these cases are plainly represented in those words concerning David: 'If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod,

and their iniquity with stripes: nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him:' God declares he will punish the offending children of very good men, yet so that their misdeeds shall not interrupt his kindness toward the rest of their posterity, or abolish his remembrance of their goodness: so we may see God dealt with Abraham and the Patriarchs, passing by (in memory of their love and reverence to him, and their faithful obedience to his will) the manifold provocations of their posterity; so that he did not for a long tract of time, and after many generations passed, suffer them (according as their personal demeanor highly deserved) to incur ruin: on this consideration he brought them out of Egypt, he settled them in Canaan, he frequently delivered them from their enemies, he restored them from oppressions and captivities; as is often expressed and insinuated in Scripture. So also it is frequently mentioned, that for David's sake, his posterity, although highly provoking God by their miscarriages, was protected and preserved; I cannot stand to mention places. I shall only farther note, that which is very obvious and most remarkable here, the difference between God's proceeding in way of severity and in way of favor; by a vast proportion the expressions of God's mercy do exceed those of justice, although both insisting on like or correspondent grounds: he visiteth the iniquities of disobedient fathers unto the third or fourth generation, but he showeth mercy to a thousand generations of those that love and obey him; he soon forgetteth the wrongs done, but he long retaineth in memory the services performed to him: which consideration should work on our ingenuity, and engage us willingly to obey so gracious a Lord.

It is also observable, that as disobedience is styled hatred of God, so loving God and keeping his commandments are conjoined as terms equivalent: they are indeed inseparably connected, love being a certain cause of obedience, obedience an infallible sign of love; 'He that hath my commandments, and observeth them, he it is,' saith our Saviour, 'that loveth me:' and, 'If any man loveth me, he will keep my word.' But I pass forward to the next.

Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his Name in vain.

It consisteth, we see, of a precept, and of a reason deterring from disobedience thereto, by declaring or threatening the mischief ensuing thereon.

The precept is, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain:' it might be rendered, Thou shalt not bring the name of the Lord thy God to a vanity, (or to a lie, for so the word שוה, *shaveh*, frequently importeth;) that is, (as it seems interpreted in a parallel place, where most of these laws are repeated, inculcated, and fenced by additional injunctions,) 'Thou shalt not swear in my name to a falsehood;' and in the 24th Psalm, 'to lift up one's soul to vanity,' is explained by swearing למרמה (*lemirmah*) to deceit or falsehood. Josephus expresseth it by ἐπὶ μηδενὶ φαύλῳ τὸν Θεὸν ὀμνύναι, to 'adjure God to no bad matter,' (or to no false matter, as the word φαῦλος commonly in good writers is taken.) And our Lord himself in his Sermon on the Mount seemeth to respect this law, when he says, 'Ye have heard that it was said to the ancients, Οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, Ye shall not forswear, but shall render to the Lord your oaths;' for he doth immediately before cite other passages out of the Decalogue, ('Thou shalt not kill,' 'Thou shalt not commit adultery,') with intention to explain or extend them; and therefore probably he proceeds respecting this law, the most conspicuous of all those which relate to this matter; and if this law be (as some conceive) supposed to signify more strictly, it had been more suitable to his purpose to cite it, than any other of more lax importance; his drift being plainly to extend in matter, and to straiten in obligation, even the fullest and strictest of ancient laws, at least as they were then commonly expounded and understood; yea, even in this case, our Lord seemeth to affirm that the ancients had no law strict and perfect enough for evangelical practice; considering which things, it is probable that the prime intent of this law is to prohibit that great sin of perjury, that is, of invoking God's attestation to a lie; thereon appealing to him, as witness and judge, that what we assert is true; as a surety, that what we promise we do stedfastly resolve and shall faithfully endeavor to perform; implying also, that we do expect a curse, and vengeance from him on us, if we be found knowingly to falsify in our affirmation, or wilfully to violate our promise.

Swearing is in its own nature immediately an act of religion, and as such was enjoined by God, ('Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name;') it expresseth the pious persuasion we have concerning God's chief attributes and prerogatives; of his omnipresence and omniscience; (extending to the knowlege of our most inward thoughts and secret purposes;) of his watchful providence over what we do; of his justice and fidelity in maintaining truth and right, in avenging iniquity and falsehood: the reason of

using it was derived from, or grounded on, a persuasion about God, which hath ever been common among men, that God, the governor and judge of the world, the protector and patron of right, is always ready, on our invocation and reference unto him, to undertake the cognisance of matters in debate and controversy between men, for the protection of truth, the maintenance of right, and preservation of peace among them; ('An oath,' saith the Apostle, 'for confirmation is to men an end of all strife;') so that the use thereof becometh a main instrument of promoting those purposes, the strongest tie of fidelity, the surest ground to proceed on in administration of justice, the most sacred band of all society; which therefore he that shall presume to violate, doth not only most unworthily wrong this or that person, this or that society of men, but doth what in him lies to subvert the foundations of all public justice and peace; withal most impiously abusing and affronting God Almighty himself; profaning his most sacred ordinance, making his name instrumental to the compassing his deceitful and base purposes, despising his judgment, and defying his vengeance.

This seems to be the first and direct meaning of this law; but it may by parity of reason well be extended farther, so as we may hereby understand all light and vain swearing, all wanton and irreverent use of God's holy name: and hitherto our Lord hath plainly extended it, forbidding us to swear at all, and charging us in our conversation to use only the simple and plain manner of assertion, or promise, saying only, 'Yea, yea,' or 'Nay, nay;' without presuming on any slight occasion to introduce the holy name of God; which indeed we should not without extreme awe of spirit ever think on, nor without high veneration dare to mention: it is an instance of the most sottish folly, it is an argument of the most horrible impiety that can be, thus (without any cause, or temptation thereto, without any profit or pleasure thence) to trifle with the Divine Majesty; to abuse his glorious name, and provoke his dreadful vengeance: 'who will in no wise hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.'

Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy, &c.

THE Decalogue is in several places of Scripture (as we before noted) called a covenant with the Jewish people, and the observation of this law is likewise so called in a particular and special manner: it is expressed to have been appointed as a sign, or characteristical note, whereby their peculiar relation to

God might be discerned, and they distinguished from all other people. As circumcision was a seal of the covenant made with Abraham and his posterity; so keeping the Sabbath did obsignate the covenant made with the children of Israel after their delivery out of Egypt; 'The children of Israel,' saith the text, 'shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant: it is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever:' and, 'I gave them,' (saith God in Ezekiel) 'my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall live in them: moreover I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord, who sanctifies them:' and, 'Thou camest down from mount Sinai,' (say the Levites in Nehemiah,) 'and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbaths:' where making known to them the Sabbaths, as also otherwhere giving them the Sabbath, are expressions, (together with the special ends of the Sabbath's appointment, which are mentioned in those places,) confirming the judgment of the ancient Christians, Justin, M. Irenæus, Tertullian, &c. who refer the first institution of the Sabbath to Moses, affirming (that which indeed the history by its total silence concerning the Sabbath before him sufficiently doth seem to confirm) that the Patriarchs were not obliged thereto, nor did practise it.

And we may observe that the law concerning the Sabbath is mentioned and insisted on separately from the body of their laws, as being in nature different from the rest, and enacted on a special design; as from the forecited passages appeareth; and farther may appear from considering how the condition of proselytes (those of the stricter sort, called proselytes of righteousness) is described in Isaiah; 'The sons of the strangers,' saith God in that Prophet, 'that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer:' where to undertake the observance of the Sabbath, and to lay hold of the Jewish covenant, are signified to be coincident, or especially coherent.

All the other precepts indeed (one passage in the second commandment, as it may be understood to prohibit absolutely the making of any similitude, being liable to exception) are immediately grounded in the reason of the thing, and have a necessary obligation, even visible to natural light; they conse-

quently have been acknowleged as reasonable and obliging by the general consent of men; or might be so propounded and asserted by argument, as easily to extort such consent: but this command, (although as to its general and remote matter it is most evidently reasonable, and requireth that which no man can deny to be matter of necessary duty, yet,) as to the more immediate matter, as to the determinate measure and manner of performing those general duties, no reason can discern an obligation distinct from, or antecedent to, the Lawgiver's will, to practise according thereto: that we should frequently with grateful and joyful sense reflect on the glorious works of God; (especially that grand and fundamental one, wherein God's wonderful excellences of goodness, wisdom, and power, were so illustriously displayed, the creation of the world; wherein so great accommodations and benefits were generally dispensed to all the creatures, and to us eminently among them; remembering with deepest respect and most hearty thankfulness our bountiful Maker;) that we should not be unmindful of the special favors by God's gracious providence vouchsafed to our country, or relations, ourselves; (especially such very signal ones, as was that of the delivery from Egyptian slavery in a manner so remarkable and miraculous) that we should not spend ourselves and our time in perpetually carking and laboring about affairs touching our body and this present life; but should assign some competent time both for the relaxation of our mind, and for attendance to the concernments of our soul: that also we should allow fitting time of respite and refreshment to those of our brethren, whom Divine Providence hath disposed into a meaner condition and relation of servants to us; that their lives may not by incessant care and toil be rendered overburdensome and grievous to them, but so that they may with some comfort serve us; that also they be not destituted of leisure and opportunity to serve God, our common Master; and to regard the welfare of their souls, no less precious than our own: that also we should show some kindness and mercy even toward our beasts, allowing them some ease from their painful drudgeries in our behalf: these are all of them things which reason evidently dictates, which common sense must needs admit, as duties of piety, justice, and humanity: and to secure the performance of them, both as to the substance, due measure, and fit manner of them, common prudence would suggest that set times should be appointed; in which they should be solemnly and notoriously discharged, under the public testimony and cognisance: and accordingly we find that, in all wise and civil societies, some provision ever hath

been made, by appointing festival times, for the practice of such duties, in some kind or degree; 'The founders of laws,' saith Seneca,* 'did institute festival days, that men should publicly be constrained to cheerfulness; interposing, as necessary, a temperament of their pains:' Plato, with a more admirable sagacity, refers the invention, or first institution, of such times unto God himself; 'The Gods' (saith he; that is, the Divine Providence administering affairs here by the ministry of inferior invisible powers, according to his notion and manner of speaking) 'pitying mankind, born to painful labor, appointed, for an ease and cessation from their toils, the recourses of festival seasons observed to the gods.'† Thus, I say, reason acknowleges the substance of these duties, and approves the securing their performance, as a good end, or fit matter of law, both divine and human. But as to the circumstantial determination of measure and manner; that a seventh day precisely should be assigned, that a total cessation from labor for man and beast should be prescribed; this is above reason to discern a necessity of, or a conveniency in comparison with other limitations in those respects devisable and practicable: nor can we assuredly resolve the obligation thereto into any other ground than the pleasure of the most wise Author of this law, who did see what was most fit to be prescribed to those whom this law concerned. Here is indeed mentioned a reason, why God especially did choose this day to bless, and sanctify it in this manner to such purposes; namely, his resting on the seventh day from his works of creation; the which yet doth not certainly import a natural conveniency, toward accomplishing those purposes, of this precise quantity of time, or in this way of observing it, in preference to any other that might have been appointed; it only seemeth to imply a fitness of these determinations, as containing somewhat of profitable significancy, that such a correspondency in circumstance of time, and manner of practice, might admonish us concerning the substance of our duty, or a principal part thereof, peculiarly designed in the sanction of this law, the grateful commemoration of God's most glorious work, (the foundation, as it were, of all other his acts of beneficence,) the creation of the world: for thus in all ceremonial institutions we may observe, that some significant circumstance is selected on purpose to instruct or excite us to practice, by representing to our fancy the nature and intention of the main duty required; as in circumcision, in the passover, in baptism, and other ritual constitutions, it is not hard to per-

* Sen de tranq. An. † Plat. de Leg. ii. p. 787.

ceive: so it being God's design to enforce the performance of that excellent duty, by appropriating a time thereto; we may conceive that he therefore especially selected that day, as most apt to mind them, to whom this law was given, of the history of the creation; the reflecting on and celebrating which was the main duty intended.

Seeing therefore the observation of the Sabbath is expressed to have a peculiar respect to the children of Israel, as a sign of the covenant made with them, when he led them out of Egypt; seeing in its own nature it differeth from the rest of the ten Laws, the obligation thereto being not, discernibly to natural light, grounded in the reason of the thing, we can nowise be assured that an universal and perpetual obligation thereto was intended, or that its obligation did extend farther than to the Jews, to whom it was as a formal law delivered, and on special considerations severely inculcated; to whose humor, condition, and circumstances, it might also perhaps be particularly suited: Justin Martyr was of opinion that this law, as many others, was given to the Jews *διὰ τὴν ἀνομίαν, καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν*, 'for their iniquity, and hardness of heart,' by way of concession and indulgence; for, because they by their natural disposition were apt to forget their Maker; to neglect the state of their soul, being wholly intent on worldly affairs; to exact intolerable pains from their brethren, who served them; to use cruelly the poor beasts employed in tilling their ground, or bearing their burdens; therefore God (considering this incorrigible temper of theirs) did indulge six days to them for the prosecution of those affairs to which they were so devoted, contenting himself to exact from them no more than this part of time for his own service, for the benefit of servants and ease of beasts: if he had required more of them, they could, it seems, or would hardly have endured it; the command would perhaps not only have been disobeyed itself, but the dislike thereof might have rendered them averse from all religion and service of God; as it happeneth, when commands very rigorous, and exceeding men's strength, are enjoined: for we see the Prophets complain of them, that they could hardly be induced to go thus far, or to afford God this so moderate share of time; but were impatient even for this one day in seven to abstain from their secular business, to relax themselves, or their servants or their cattle, from their daily labors: they impeach them for polluting, profaning, hiding their eyes from (that is, wholly overlooking, neglecting, and disregarding) the Sabbath; for doing their own pleasure, and exacting their own labors on it; for not delighting therein, or not willingly observing it: 'Hear this,' saith

the prophet Amos, 'O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?' This being the disposition of that people, not bearing a greater strictness, they not being able to preserve within their hearts a perpetual remembrance of God's works and favors; not to moderate their pursuits of temporal good things; not to bear a due regard and tenderness toward their brethren and their fellow-creatures; (the performing which things in a constant uninterrupted tenor, the said holy Father and blessed Martyr supposeth to be the sabbatism which Christians are bound to observe;) therefore God, considering their infirmity and incapacity to comply with higher injunctions, did use (as in the cases of divorce, revenge, and the like) an indulgence toward them, permitting them on the other days to 'do their pleasure,' as the Prophet speaks, reserving only this day for a punctual and solemn performance of the duties specified: thus discourses that good ancient in his Dialogue with the Jew. However, that this law (as to its circumstantial parts) was not intended to oblige generally and perpetually, we have a most forcible ground to suppose; St. Paul himself, his express discharging Christians from the observation thereof; yea, his earnest reprehension of some persons for rigorously insisting thereon, deeming themselves, and urging it on others, as a necessary duty to observe it; his conjoining it with other ceremonial observances, whose nature was merely symbolical, and whose design was to continue no longer, than till the real substance of that which they represented came into full force and practice; 'Let no man,' saith he to the Colossians, 'judge you for meat, or drink, or on account of a festival day, or new moon, or Sabbath: which things are the shadow of future things; but the body is of Christ;' (that is, they did only prefigure and presignify; the real substance intended and represented by them is somewhat in the law and doctrine of Christ; which coming immediately to appear and to oblige, that shadow vanisheth, and ceaseth to have any regard due thereto:) again more sharply to the Galatians, whom some Judaising dogmatists had reduced or were reducing to the practice of legal rites, under conceit of needful obligation to them; 'How,' saith he, 'do ye return again to those weak and beggarly elements, to which back again you are pleased to be enslaved? Ye observe days, and months, and years:' which words, that they relate generally to the Jewish festivals, the context doth plainly enough show, and there is good reason to think that they chiefly respect the Sabbath we

treat on, for which probably these men had the greatest respect and zeal: again, in the 14th to the Romans, the same great patron and champion of Christian liberty not obscurely declareth his mind that Christians of strength in judgment did regard no day above another, but esteemed all days (he excepteth none) alike, as to any special obligation, grounded on divine law and right; in subordination to which doctrine we may add that this appears with great evidence to have been the common opinion of the wisest and most orthodox Christians in the primitive church, the most constant and strict adherents to Catholic tradition, (who from the Apostles' instruction best understood the purport and limits of the liberty purchased by Christ,) that this law, as it was not known or practised before Moses, so it ceased to oblige after Christ; being one of the shadows which the evangelical light dispelled, one of the burdens which this law of liberty did take off us.

Now although on these accounts we cannot press the strict observation of this law in all its parts, according to its literal and direct intention, yet we may learn much of our duty, much of God's will from it: all God's laws, spiritually and wisely understood, did tend to the promoting of piety and virtue; and abstracting from the special circumstances of that people, to whom they were consigned, may (so far as our case is like theirs, and wherein a common reason doth appear) pass for fit patterns for us to imitate, suggesting proper means of exercising, nourishing, increasing those qualities in us; and so from this law we may learn these duties:

1. That we should frequently call to mind and consider the great and glorious works of God, performed for the general good of his creatures, and specially for mankind: the creation of the world; the redemption of mankind; the nativity, passion, resurrection, and exaltation of our Lord and Saviour, and the like, no less now considerable to us, both in respect of glory due to God, and of benefit accruing to us, than was the creation formerly to the Jews.

2. That we are bound to restrain ourselves in the prosecution of worldly business; not distracting our minds with care, not exhausting our bodies with toil about them; but allowing our mind convenient and seasonable freedom, affording our soul sufficient leisure with vigor and alacrity to enjoy its nobler entertainments, and to pursue its higher interests.

3. That we are obliged to use the same indulgence toward those whom Divine Providence hath disposed to be under our power, care, or governance: to allow our children, our subjects, our servants, a competent measure of rest and refreshment

from their ordinary labors, sufficient time and leisure undistractedly to serve God, and quietly to mind their spiritual welfare: we must so charitably tender their good, as to permit and procure that their life may be easy and comfortable here; and that also they may have means to obtain for themselves a happy immortality hereafter; not being in these respects either harsh to their outward man, or uncharitable to their souls.

4. That we must not be unmerciful to any creature; not only abstaining from inflicting, in wantonness of humor, needless vexation on them, but also from wearying and grieving them too much for our emolument or convenience: the advantage and preeminency bestowed on us by God over them should be managed with moderation and clemency; we should be gentle masters to them, not cruel tyrants over them: we should consider that God did make them, as to help and serve us, so to enjoy somewhat themselves of delight and satisfaction in their being; which if we go to deprive them of, rendering their condition intolerable, and worse than if they had no being, as we do abuse and injure them, transgressing the bounds of our right over them, so we encroach on, disappoint, and wrong their Maker, and cannot therein but displease him: doing thus is a point of injustice not enough considered by them who commit it: they consider not how beastly they are themselves, when they misuse poor beasts.

5. We may hence farther learn that it is fit certain times should be allotted for the public and solemn performance of the forenamed duties: common reason prompteth that God (on whose protection and disposal the public good depends) should be publicly honored, and his benefits frequently acknowleged; also that care should be taken in every society, that all states of men should lead their lives in some competent degree of content; that all objects of grievous pity should be removed from public view; also common sense will inform us that these things cannot effectually be executed without constituting definite periods of time, and limiting circumstances, according to which they shall be practised under public inspection and censure: and these dictates of ordinary prudence the divine Wisdom hath ratified by his exemplary order; the which, in cases wherein he hath not interposed his direct authority by way of precept, may serve for a good direction to governors, what they may with safety, what they should in wisdom, establish; what provision they should make for the promotion of piety and virtue: such a precedent requires greatest veneration and respect, cannot but appear of high moment in consultation about matters of this nature.

It is indeed particularly observable that in this command there is not an express order concerning the natural or moral service of God (by prayer, or hearing God's Law) to be publicly performed on this day; but the Jews were themselves so wise, as to understand these duties couched in the sanctification of the day prescribed to them; and accordingly they practised; they in all places of their habitation did settle synagogues and oratories; to them on this day they resorted; in them then they did offer devotions to God, (as the names προσευχαὶ and προσευκτήρια do import;) the Scribes did read the Law, and expound it to the people: 'Moses,' saith Josephus, 'did command the people to assemble for hearing of the Law, not once, or twice, or many times, but every seventh day, laying aside their works, and exactly to learn it;'* whence, addeth he, the people became so skilful in the laws, that 'if one asked any of them concerning them, he would more easily tell them all than his own name;'† whence also an admirable concord in mind and uniformity in practice did, as he farther observes, arise: and, 'The custom,' saith Philo, 'was always as occasion gave leave, especially on the seventh days, to philosophate,'‡ &c. In consideration of which practice it was, that the Jews so highly valued this precept, that it was a saying among them, 'The Sabbath weigheth against all the Commandments;' as procuring them all to be known and observed. And if that blind people could pick these duties out of this Law, much more should we see ourselves obliged, according to the analogy thereof, to appoint set times for insuring the practice of them.

6. Again; we may hence also learn our obligation to submit obediently to the constitution of governors relating to this matter; that we readily should observe all solemn times of festivity and rest, which the rulers of church or state do appoint for the securing or the promoting those purposes of piety or charity, according to the measure and manner prescribed by them: for reason approving the thing as good and useful, and divine order more clearly and fully confirming it to be so, and it not appearing that God hath made express determinations about it, it remains, that it is left wholly to them to whose care God hath intrusted the public welfare, and hath committed to their judgments the providing means conducible thereto; having also consequently enjoined us in all lawful things to follow their guidance and appointment in order thereto. God decreed death to be inflicted on those who violated his com-

* Joseph. adv. App. ii. p. 946. † Ibid. p. 947.
‡ Philo de Vit. Mos.

mand concerning the Sabbath, which showeth how great a fault it is to offend in this particular; and we may reasonably esteem that command to be his, which proceedeth from his ministers by authority from himself, and in conformity to his own pattern.

7. We add that whereas God required of the Jews such a portion of time to be solemnly dedicated to religion and mercy, we, to whom he hath vouchsafed higher benefits, and proposed greater encouragements, cannot reasonably but deem ourselves obliged to sequester and consecrate as much or more time to the same intents: we should indeed be content to withdraw ourselves more frequently from pursuance of our own profits and pleasures to the service of God, to the remembrance and celebration of his favors; we should willingly allow greater relaxation to our dependents: and should the public be deficient in exacting a performance of such duties from us, it would become us to supply such defects by our private devoting fit and frequent seasons thereto; that in some proportion we may exceed the Jews in grateful piety, as we surpass them in the matter and causes thereof; that we may appear in some degree more charitable than they, as we have much greater reason and obligation to be so than they. So much for this.

I proceed briefly to consider the remaining commandments, the which immediately concern another object: those foregoing did chiefly serve to regulate our religious practice in yielding due reverence toward God; these following (which are supposed to have made up the second of those Tables, which, written by God's hand, were delivered to Moses, and preserved in the ark of the testimony) do guide our conversation and carriage toward our neighbor; in the front of which worthily is placed that which obligeth to dutifulness toward our parents; unto whom, after God and his supreme vicegérents, we owe the highest respect, gratitude, and duty.

Honor thy Father and thy Mother.

'Honor:' the word signifies to have in weighty regard, and aptly serves to denote those particular acts of duty, which are otherwhere expressed in Scripture; fear and reverence; ('Ye shall fear every man his father and his mother:') observance and obedience; ('Children, obey your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing to God:') gratitude and retribution; ('Let children learn ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν, to be pious toward their own family;' and ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι, to render suitable returns, or 'to requite their parents; for this is good and accept-

able before God :') regarding their instruction and advice; ('My son, hear the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the law of thy mother:') it also comprehendeth a prohibition of the contrary acts, contemning, cursing, offering violence or contumely unto, disobedience or contumacy toward parents, the which are forbidden under capital penalties and dreadful comminations: 'Cursed be he that setteth light by his father or mother;' and, 'The eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it;' (that is, God in a fearful and strange manner will avenge that wickedness on him :) and in the law it is ordained that the rebellious and stubborn son, who will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that when they have chastened him will not hearken unto them, shall be stoned by all the men of his city, and put to death in that manner.

Whence we may learn the nature of the duty here enjoined, and what rank it beareth among other duties; what high obligation belongs thereto, of what consideration it is with God, and how grievous a crime the violation thereof is; that, briefly, we are obliged to yield our parents high affection of heart, great expressions of respect and observance in word and deed; that the neglect of these duties is, next to that of profaneness and undutifulness toward God himself, the greatest disorder we can be guilty of: this all civil nations have consented to be our duty; and if we consider the grounds on which it is built, we shall find that reason, justice, and necessity do require it: St. Paul presseth his precept of observance to parents with a τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι δίκαιον, 'for this is just and equal;' for if we look on the disposition of parents in their mind toward children, we may presume them always full of tender affection and good-will toward them, full of desire and care for their good, full of pity and compassion toward them, in the highest and most especial degree beyond what they bear to others; which dispositions in reason and equity do require answerable dispositions in those on whom they are placed, and who from them do receive inestimable benefits; for if we do regard the effects proceeding from them, we shall discern that,

1. From parents children do receive being and life; that good which nature inclineth so highly to value and tender, as the foundation of all the good, happiness, and comfort we are capable of.

2. They are obliged to their parents for the preservation, maintenance, and protection of their life: it is a long time before we come to be able (such is the particular condition of

man among all living creatures, so ordered on purpose, as it were, to beget this obligation and endearment) anywise to provide for or to defend ourselves; and the doing thereof, in that senseless and helpless state, relies on the care, pain, and solicitous vigilance of our parents; the which they are not only always obliged, but are commonly disposed, with admirable willingness, to spend on their children.

3. Parents not only thus at first undergo such care and trouble to maintain their children, but by expensive education (often with much inconvenience and incommodity to themselves) they provide means for their future support and subsistence during life.

4. Children are so strictly tied to their parents, as by their willing concession to partake in all the comforts of their state and ornaments of their fortune.

5. The goods acquired by the parents' industry do usually devolve on their children by inheritance and succession; whence that children live handsomely and comfortably is the reward of their parents' merit, comes from the store that they have carefully provided and laid up for them.

6. To which we may add that not only the provision for our temporal necessities and conveniences dependeth on our parents, but the care of our souls, and our spiritual welfare is incumbent on them: they are obliged to instruct us in the fear of God, and to set us in the way toward eternal happiness.

7. We may consider also that all this they do most frankly, and out of pure kindness; without regard to any merit antecedent, or benefit consequent to themselves: as they received nothing to oblige and move them to such performances, so they can seldom hope for answerable returns: it is abundant satisfaction to them, if they see their children do well; their chief delight and contentment is in their children's good absolutely and abstractedly, without indirect regards to their own advantage.

On these and the like accounts, it appeareth that as parents have the affections most resembling those of God toward us, as they perform toward us the actions most like to his, as they are the principal instruments of divine providence and bounty, (by which God's blessings are conveyed and conferred on us;) so they may be deemed in a sort to represent God, and, as his most lively images, have an especial veneration due to them. God himself, to endear and render himself amiable, or in the most kindly way venerable to us, to engage us to a more ready obedience of him, to declare the nature of our duty toward

him, assumes the title of Father; and all nations have agreed to style him so: reciprocally also, whereas the duties toward other men are termed justice, or charity, or courtesy, or liberality, or gratitude, those toward parents in every language (I suppose) are styled piety, implying somewhat divine in the object of those duties; it is more than injustice to wrong a parent; it is more than uncharitableness to refuse them succor or relief; it is more than discourtesy to be unkind to them; it is more than sordid avarice to be in their need illiberal to them; it is rather high impiety to offend in any of these kinds.

He that returns not love in answer to their tender affection; that doth not (as occasion requires, and his ability permits) requite the benefits received from them, doth not defer to them an especial reverence, in regard to that sacred name and character they bear, thereby intimates that he would in like manner be unjust, ungrateful, and disingenuous toward God, from whom he hath received the like benefits; the beginning and continuance of his being: the preservation, maintenance, and protection of his life: if he will not honor his earthly parents, whom he hath seen, how will he reverence his heavenly Father, whom he hath not seen? so we may, according to St. John, argue.

I might subjoin, that as justice and ingenuity do enforce this duty, so for the good of the world there is a necessity that it should be observed: if parents are not only by natural instinct disposed, but by divine command obliged, and by human law (the preservation of the world so requiring) constrained to undergo such hardships for the maintenance and education of their children, it is fit and necessary they should be supported and encouraged in the bearing them by reciprocal obligations in children to return them dutiful respect, observance, and requital; the world could not well subsist without children being engaged to these duties: there were no reason to exact, there were no ground to expect, that parents should cheerfully and faithfully discharge their part on other terms.

To this precept there is added a promise, (and it is, as St. Paul observeth, the 'first precept that hath a promise' formally annexed; whereby he enforceth his exhortation to the observance thereof.)

That thy Days may be long on the Land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

So God expressly promiseth to bless dutiful children with a

long life in the comfortable possession of those good things which he should bestow on them; this was the most of reward, explicitly covenanted to the Jews, in regard to their obedience: there is also implied a commination of a contrary curse from God on the infringers of this law, that they should either be immaturely cut off from life, (as Abimelech and Absalom were on this score,) or should draw on a wretched life in banishment from the contents thereof: by which things respectively are intimated to us the rewards of piety in this kind, or the punishments of impiety in the future state, whereof the land here mentioned was a shadow or figure: what length of days in Canaan was to them, that to us is immortal life in heaven; what being excluded thence was then, that now is everlasting death, or banishment into the regions of misery.

I might also note the congruity of the reward propounded, that they who are grateful to those from whom, in subordination to God, they received life, shall by God's dispensation enjoy that life long and well; and that they who neglect the authors of their life, shall soon be deprived of it, or of its comforts. But I find the same reward assigned to the diligent observers of other duties; particularly to them who are just in their dealings; to them who are charitable to the poor; to them who are meek and patient; to them who confide in God; and all good men that obey God's commandments.

I shall only add, farther, that we may, according to analogy and like ground of reason, reduce unto this commandment the obligation we have to honor all those who perform toward us beneficial offices like unto those which we receive from our parents; those who preserve our life by relief, protection, or defence; those who afford us maintenance or education; those who watch over us for the good of our body or of our soul; those who instruct us, or advise us; such are our governors and magistrates, either political or ecclesiastical; our benefactors and patrons; our schoolmasters and tutors; our especial faithful friends; and the like: but I pass forward.

In the subsequent precepts are contained the prime rules of justice toward our neighbor; the observation of which is not only most equal and reasonable in itself, but necessary for the preservation of civil society, and public peace among men; for the procurement of our safe and pleasant living and conversing in the world; men thereby being secured in the quiet enjoyment of God's gifts and the fruits of their industry, and of whatever is dear and precious to them; of their lives first; then of the comforts of their conjugal state; of their possessions; of their reputations; the laws respecting these being here disposed

in order, according to the value of their respective objects, in the nature of things, or in the opinion of men, or in regard to the consequences arising from them.

Thou shalt not kill.

Of all good gifts conferred on us, none (according to the natural and common esteem of men) is more precious than life itself, the foundation of enjoying the rest. God hath therefore reserved the disposal of it intirely to himself as his special prerogative; neither he that hath it, nor any other person having absolutely any just power or right over it; no man can take away any man's life, but by commission or licence from God, reasonably presumed to be granted by him: so may God (the absolute king of the world) be supposed to have committed to lawful magistrates, as his vicegerents and officers, in his name and behalf, on reasonable cause, for preservation of public justice, peace, and order, in a lawful course of justice, to dispose of men's lives, who have forfeited them to the law; (the magistrate, as St. Paul saith, 'beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath on him that doeth evil.') He hath not forbidden sovereigns (in case of necessity, and when amicable means will not prevail) to maintain the safety or welfare of the societies intrusted to their care, even by armed violence, against such as wrongfully invade them, or anywise harm them, and will not otherwise be induced to forbear doing so; in which case the resolution of such differences (insomuch as they cannot be tried at any other bar, or composed by other means) is referred to God's arbitrement; who is the Lord of Hosts, the sovereign protector of right, and dispenser of success; the soldier, in a just cause, being then his minister, and carrying a tacit commission from him. God also may be supposed, together with life, with a natural love to it, with means to preserve it, to have imparted to every man a right to defend his life, with its necessary supports, against unjust, extreme, and inevitable violence on it, or them: the slaughter therefore which may happen in these cases (or in the like, wherein God hath plainly by a general order, or by special command, or by permission reasonably supposed, conferred on any person a power over his neighbor's life, in the maintenance of God's own honor, or in subserviency to public good) is not concerned in the design or meaning of this precept: for he that kills another, in a way not irregular, as a minister of justice, or in a lawful war, as a soldier authorised by a sovereign power here under God, or for his own just and ne-

cessary defence, doth not, according to the intent of this law, kill; but rather God himself, the Lord of life and death, doth then kill; the authority of killing so being derived from him, and his work being done thereby; vengeance is his, and he so (by his instruments) repays it. But here is forbidden all other voluntary taking away our neighbor's life, when a man acts as a private person; without just and necessary cause, in any illegal or irregular way; on what motive, principle, or end soever, (whether it be out of hatred, spite, envy, revenge; for our presumed safety, or pretended reparation of honor; for promoting what interest, or procuring what satisfaction soever to ourselves,) by what means soever, either by direct violence, or by fraudulent contrivance; in an open or clandestine manner; immediately by ourselves, or by means of others; by advising, encouraging, anywise becoming instrumental, or accessory thereto.

This is the crime expressly prohibited: but a positive duty should also be understood; that we are obliged, so far as we are able, to preserve our neighbor's life; by relieving him in extreme need, by succoring him in extreme danger; by admonishing him of any destructive mischief, when he appears tending unawares thereinto; the neglect of which things argueth a murderous disposition toward our neighbor, is in reasonable esteem, and in God's sight a killing of him; for we mistake, if we think with Cain, that we are not our brother's keepers, or are not bound, when we are able, to preserve his life.

The violation of which commandment is certainly the most heinous sin that can be committed of all those which are not immediately directed against God himself, or the persons which peculiarly represent him; and a sin which never can escape vengeance and due punishment from him. It is the greatest wrong to God; it is the extremest injury to our neighbor; it is the highest sort of uncharitableness; it is a principal offence against public society.

1. It is an exceeding wrong and affront done unto God; in assuming the disposal of his gifts: in dispossessing him of his rights, by robbing him of a creature, of his child, his servant, his subject, (one whose life is precious to him, and toward whom he beareth a tender regard;) an usurping in a high way his sovereign authority, his throne of majesty, his tribunal of justice, his sword of vengeance; to omit the sacrilege, as Philo speaks, committed herein by violating God's own image, which every man doth bear.

2. It is also an extreme injury to the person, who is thereby deprived of an unvaluable good, which can nowise be repaired

or compensated: he that loses his life, doth therewith lose all the good he possesseth, or is capable of here, without any possibility of recovering it again: the taking therefore of life can be no suitable revenge, no reasonable satisfaction, for any injury or damage received; it infinitely, in a manner, surpasseth all the evil, which any man can sustain from another in his estate, or fame, or welfare of any kind; for those things have their measure, and may be capable of some reparation, but this is altogether extreme and irreparable; and therefore doth include greatest iniquity: add hereto, that not only all temporal good is hereby at once ravished from a man, but the soul also of the person may incur the greatest damage or hazard in respect to its future estate by being thus snatched away: the slayer not only robbeth his brother of his temporal life, but of his time of repentance, and opportunity of making peace with God.

3. It is also the highest uncharitableness to deal thus with our neighbor; arguing that nothing of good-will, of pity, of humanity toward him is left in us: to hate his brother to the death is the utmost pitch of hatred. If in imitation of our Saviour, and out of respect to him, we ought, as St. John instructeth us, to be willing to lay down our lives for our brethren; how enormous a crime, how opposite to Christian charity is it, to take away our brother's life!

4. It is likewise a main offence against the public; not only by unlawful bereaving it of a member and subject, but to its prejudice and dishonor (yea, so far as lies in us to its subversion and dissolution) assuming to ourselves, pulling away from it, its rights and prerogatives of judgment.

Such, briefly, is the direct intent and importance of this law: but our Saviour in his comment hereon hath explained and extended it farther, so as to interdict all that anywise approaches in nature, or in effect tends unto this heinous evil: he means to obstruct all the springs, and extirpate all the roots thereof; such as are rash, causeless, outrageous, inveterate anger, contumelious and despiteful language, reserving grudges or spite in our heart, not endeavoring speedily to reconcile ourselves to them who have done us injury or displeasure; for these things, as they commonly do produce the act of murder, so they argue inclinations thereto, (which, if fear and self-respect did not restrain, would produce it,) and consequently in moral account, which regardeth not so much the act as the will, are of the same quality therewith; however they arise from the same bitter root of great uncharitableness; on which score St. John telleth us that 'he that hateth his brother is a murderer;' and

consequently in effect all malice and spite, envy, hatred, malignity, rancor, immoderate and pertinacious anger and animosity are here prohibited.

Thou shalt not commit Adultery.

After life, (if after that, for this command in the Greek translation of Exodus, (though not in Deuteronomy,) in some places of the New Testament, and in sundry ancient writers, is placed before that against murder,) nothing commonly is more dear to men, than the comforts of their conjugal estate; the enjoyment of that special affection and friendship, together with those instances of benevolence, which by divine institution and mutual contract, ratified by most sacred and solemn promises of fidelity, are reserved peculiar to that state: which inclosures therefore of his neighbor whoever shall invade or trespass on, who shall anywise loose or slacken those holy bands, who shall attempt the affection or chastity of his neighbor's wife, doth most grievously offend God, and committeth (as Joseph, when he was tempted thereto, did call it) 'a great evil against God,' against his neighbor, against himself, against the common society of men. He violateth an institution, to which God hath affixed especial marks of respect and sanctity; he wounds his neighbor's honor and interest in the most tender part, wherein the content of his mind and comfort of his life are most deeply concerned. He as much (or rather more) dishonoreth and abuseth himself, not only by committing a fact of so high injustice, but by making himself accessory to the basest perfidiousness that can be. ['Whoso committeth adultery lacketh understanding: he that doeth it destroyeth his own soul. A wound and dishonor shall he get; and his reproach shall not be wiped away. For jealousy is the rage of a man; therefore he will not spare in the day of vengeance. He will not regard any ransom: neither will he rest content, though thou givest many gifts.'] He also offendeth against the public quiet and welfare, breeding inextricable confusions and implacable dissensions in families; so that hardly from any other cause such tragical events have issued as from this: in fine, this crime is, as Philo calls it, *στυγητὸν, καὶ θεομίσητον ἀδίκημα*, 'a loathsome unrighteousness, most odious to God;' and a fire, as Job representeth it, that consumeth to destruction.

But we must farther also consider that acts of this kind contain also in them another evil; that persons committing them do not only so highly wrong their neighbor, but defile themselves also by the foulest turpitude; in which respect the

prohibition of all unlawful and irregular satisfactions to lustful appetite; all compliance with that great enemy of our souls, the flesh; all kinds of impurity and lasciviousness, not in act only, but in thought, in speech, in gesture, may be reduced to this law: our Lord himself doth so interpret it, as to make it include a forbidding of all unchaste desires; and Christianity doth in a most strict and special manner oblige us to all kinds of sobriety and modesty, of chastity and purity in body and spirit; enjoining us to 'abstain from all fleshly lusts, as enemies to our souls;' to 'mortify our fleshly members;' to 'possess our vessels (or bodies) in sanctity and honor;' not to have 'any impurity, or filthiness, so much as named among us;' nor to suffer 'a foul word to proceed out of our mouth;' not to 'defile our bodies,' consecrated unto God, and made 'temples of the Holy Spirit;' excluding persons guilty of such things from any title or capacity of entering into God's kingdom: in fine, representing all such practices as most dishonorable to us, most displeasing to God, most grievous to God's Holy Spirit, (the fountain of all virtue and goodness,) most contrary to the nature and design of our religion, and most destructive of our souls.

Thou shalt not steal.

THAT every man should quietly enjoy those supports and those conveniences of life, which in any honest manner (by God's bounty immediately dispensing it, or by God's blessing on his industry) he hath acquired the possession of, or right unto, as all reason and equity do require, so it must be acknowleged absolutely necessary for the preservation of common peace, and the maintenance of civil society among men: to secure which purposes, and to encourage honest industry, this law prohibiteth all invasion or usurpation by any means whatever (either by open violence and extortion, or by clandestine fraud and surreption) of our neighbor's proper goods and right: he that in any way, against his neighbor's knowlege or will, getteth into his power, or detaineth therein, what doth in equity belong to his neighbor, and which he can restore to him, doth transgress against the intent of this law; as we see it interpreted in Leviticus, where it is thus expressed; 'Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbor, nor rob him:' defrauding by cunning practice is no less forbidden, than robbing by violent force. Anywise *ἀποστερεῖν*, (that is, to deprive our neighbor of his due;) *νοσφίζειν*, to purloin, or (by subtle and sly conveyance) to separate any part of our neighbor's substance from him; *πλεο-*

νεκτεῖν, to exact, or extort any thing more than one's due; ὑπερβαίνειν ἐν τῷ πράγματι, to go beyond, or overreach our neighbor in dealing, to delude and cozen him by false speeches or fallacious pretences, are acts, in St. Paul's expression, to be referred hither, as so many special acts of theft. I cannot stand to reckon up all the sorts of unrighteousness included here, or reducible to this matter, (such as, beside downright rapine and cheating, are, foul dealing in bargains and contracts; using false weights and measures; withholding the pledge; detaining the laborer's wages from him; the exercising vexatious, biting, and devouring usuries; removing bounds of possession; oppressing by undue or rigorous exaction; corrupting justice for reward or favor; raising gain by unlawful and shameful arts or practices; consenting or sharing with, advising or instigating to these, and the like acts; these I shall not particularly insist on,) but shall only say, that God expresseth great indignation against, and threateneth most severely to punish, all acts of this kind; 'For all,' saith he, 'that do such things, (such as use deceitful measures in trade,) and all that do unrighteousness, are an abomination unto the Lord thy God:' ἔκδικος ὁ Θεὸς περὶ πάντων τούτων, 'God (saith St. Paul, speaking against the circumventing and defrauding our neighbor) is an avenger for all these kinds of things:' nor indeed is the gospel more severe in denunciation of punishment against any crime than this; 'Know ye not, that unjust persons' (saith St. Paul, meaning this sort of unjust persons, so most properly and strictly called) 'shall not inherit the kingdom of God;' and κλέπται, πλεονέκται, ἅρπαγες, thieves, exactors, (or cheaters,) and rapacious persons, make a good party in the catalogue of those who shall be excluded from eternal bliss.

I should add the positive duties here to be understood, and referred to this matter, the which are commended to us in Scripture: such are, diligence and industry in our calling, whereby, with God's blessing, we may support ourselves, preventing the need, and escaping the temptation of encroachment on our neighbor's property; (whereby we may, as St. Paul speaketh, have need of nothing, may eat our own bread, may even have wherewith to impart to the needs of others;) contentment in that estate wherein God hath placed us, how mean soever; trusting in God, and relying on his providence; casting our burden and care on him, who hath promised to sustain us, who hath said, that he will never leave or forsake us; lastly, charitable relief of our neighbor in his need; for in such a case our neighbor hath a title to the goods we possess, derived from the appointment and donation of God, who is the abso-

lute proprietor of all we have, we being only his stewards and dispensers thereof, according to the rules he hath declared; so that if we do not, according to his order, supply our poor neighbor, we are in just estimation, we shall in God's judgment appear to be, thieves, both in respect to God himself and to our neighbor; for that we thereby detain from God what by original right is his, and bereave our neighbor of what God hath bestowed on him.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy Neighbor.

It is in the Hebrew, 'Thou shalt not answer (to wit, being examined or adjured in judgment) against thy neighbor as a false witness;' so that primarily, it seems, bearing false testimony against our neighbor (especially in matters of capital or of high concernment to him) is prohibited: yet that not only this great crime, but that all injurious (even extrajudicial) prejudicing our neighbor's reputation, and consequently his safety or his welfare in any sort, is forbidden, we may collect from that explication of this law, or that parallel law, which we have in Leviticus; 'Thou shalt not,' it is there said, 'go up and down as a talebearer among thy people; neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbor:' as a talebearer, רָכִיל; that is, a merchant, or trader in ill reports and stories concerning our neighbor, to his prejudice; defaming him, or detracting from him, or breeding in the minds of men an ill opinion of him; which vile and mischievous practice is otherwhere under several names condemned and reproved: such are muttering; ('The words of a mutterer,' saith the Wise Man, 'are as wounds, going into the innermost parts of the belly;') whispering, ψιθυρισμὸς, we have often in the Son of Sirach and in St. Paul mentioned with a bad character, or with prohibition and reproof: supplanting; (so in the good man's description, Psal. xv. it is said, 'He supplants not with his tongue;' so the word signifies:) detraction, or backbiting, καταλαλία, which is so often in the apostolical writings forbidden and reprehended: slander, or calumny, and sycophantry; that is, oppressing, abusing, or any way harming men by false tales, suggestions, or pretences: which sort of practices, how base they are in themselves, (nothing being more unworthy of an honest and ingenuous mind, nothing more ugly to the judgment of them who have any sense of goodness,) how contrary they are to justice, which doth not permit us to wrong our neighbor, as well in his credit and good name, as in his other goods, (for they perhaps may be as much valued by him, may really be of as much consequence to him,

as any thing that he hath;) which bindeth us to abstain from hurting him, as well in word as in deed; how opposite they are to charity, which obligeth us to think the best of our neighbor, and to endeavor that others also may do so; to conceal his real faults and blemishes; much more not to devise and affix false ones to him, not to gather and disperse ill reports to his prejudice; of how mischievous consequence also they are, breeding ill-will, and sowing strife in all societies both public and private, (even separating chief friends, as the Wise Man telleth us,) common sense and experience do show: they consequently must be very odious in the sight of God, who loveth the peace and welfare of men; and very offensive to men, who do the mischiefs springing from them.

To this law may be reduced our obligations to be candid in our opinions and discourses concerning others, (according to St. Paul's excellent description of charity;) to forbear all rash and harsh censure, as you know our Saviour in his most divine sermon on the Mount chargeth us; to be veracious, sincere, and faithful in all our conversation; which duties are so often taught and pressed in both Testaments: 'Ye shall not,' saith the Law, 'steal, nor deal falsely, nor lie one to another;' and, 'To walk uprightly, and work righteousness, and speak the truth from his heart,' are the first lineaments in the good man's character drawn by the psalmist; and, 'These are the things ye shall do,' saith God in the Prophet; 'Speak ye every man the truth to his neighbor; execute the judgment of truth and peace in your gates:' and in the New Testament, To lay aside lying, to speak the truth every man with his neighbor; to lay aside all malice, all guile, all hypocrisies, envyings, and backbitings, are apostolical commands.

Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbor's House; thou shalt not covet thy Neighbor's Wife; nor his Man-servant, nor his Maid-servant, nor his Ox, nor his Ass, nor any thing that is thy Neighbor's.

THIS law is comprehensive and recapitulatory, as it were, of the rest concerning our neighbor, prescribing universal justice toward him; (whence St. Mark, it seems, meaneth to render it in one word, by μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, 'deprive not,' or bereave not your neighbor of any thing;) and this not only in outward deed and dealing, but in inward thought and desire, the spring whence they do issue forth, (for, 'from the heart,' as our Saviour teacheth, 'do proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, falsewitness, blasphemies;') we are

obliged to be so far from depriving our neighbor of any good thing belonging to him, that we are not so much as to wish or desire it; not only to abstain from injurious action, but to repress covetous inclinations: wherein is also implied that we should have a delight and complacence in our neighbor's good; not envying him any enjoyment; being in our minds content with the portion God pleaseth to vouchsafe us; and intirely trusting in him, that he will supply us with what is needful or befitting to us, without the damage of our neighbor. Thus 'God's law is,' as St. Paul observed, 'spiritual;' not only restraining exterior acts, but regulating our inmost thoughts, quelling all inordinate appetites and affections of heart within us; the which may be extended so as to respect not only matters of justice toward our neighbor, but all objects whatever of our practice; so as to import that which in the Christian law is so frequently enjoined us, as the life of our religion, circumcising our hearts, crucifying the flesh with its passions and desires, mortifying our earthly members, putting to death by the Spirit the deeds of the body, putting off the old man, which is corrupted according to the deceitful lusts: Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, 'Thou shalt not unlawfully or irregularly desire,' doth, according to the spiritual intent, import all this.

I have done; and shall only add, that the sum and end of these, and all other good laws, of all religion, and all our duty, is (as we often are taught in the New Testament) comprised in those two rules, of loving God with all our heart, and loving our neighbor as ourselves; seriously and honestly attending unto which, we can hardly fail of knowing what in any case our duty is: it remains that we employ our best care and endeavor on the conscientious practice thereof; imploring therewith the assistance of God's grace, and that good Spirit, which God hath most graciously promised to those who duly ask it, by which alone we can be enabled to keep God's commandments: to him be all glory and praise. Amen.

SUMMARY OF THE

DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

PREVIOUS observations, on the excellency and design of our religion ; and on the nature of the word *Sacrament*, &c.

Of Baptism. Several kinds of baptism in use among the Jews : the form of it assumed by our Saviour. What the action enjoined is, explained : also the mystery thereby signified. The benefits conferred on us enumerated. 1. The purgation, or absolution of our sins. Digression on infant baptism. 2. The gift of God's holy Spirit. 3. The benefit of regeneration. 4. Our insertion into God's Church, &c. 5. A title (under the condition of perseverance) to eternal life. Enumeration of the duties which this holy rite implies, on our side. These often expressed in Scripture by the words *faith* and *repentance:* nature of this faith explained. Concluding exhortations.

The Eucharist.

FIRST Institution of the Passover. Annual and mysterious ceremony, to commemorate this act of God, and his mercy towards his people. The same looking also (like many other Jewish rites) directly to that great delivery of mankind from sin and hell designed by the Almighty. The commemoration of this holy rite improved by our Saviour to the institution of the Eucharist. The action itself, or rather the whole rite, described in the Gospels, and in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. The various parts of this rite enumerated, &c. Mysterious importance of it, in the following particulars. 1. In the com-

memorative representation of our Saviour's passion, &c. 2. The benefits of that passion represented and effectually conveyed to us. 3. Declaration of that union which good Christians partaking thereof have with Christ. 4. Union among our Saviour's true disciples thereby signified and sealed. Many duties incumbent on us from this institution. 1. Those considered which arise antecedently to our partaking of this holy mystery. 2. Those which accompany it. 3. Those which are consequent thereon. Another duty specified, as consisting in our gladly embracing any opportunity of celebrating this rite. Practice of the primitive Christians in this respect. Concluding observations.

THE

DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

It is a peculiar excellency of our religion, that it doth not much employ men's care, pains, and time, about matters of ceremonial observance; but doth chiefly (and in a manner wholly) exercise them in works of substantial duty, agreeable to reason, perfective of man's nature, productive of true glory to God, and solid benefit to men. Its design is not to amuse our fancies with empty shows, nor to take up our endeavors in fruitless performances; but to render us truly good and like unto God: first in interior disposition of mind, then in exterior practice; full of hearty love and reverence to God, of tender charity and goodwill toward men; of moderation and purity in the enjoyment of these things; of all true piety and virtue; whereby we may become qualified for that life of bliss which it tendereth and promiseth; for conversation in that holy society above, to which it designeth and calleth us. Yet because fancy is naturally a medium, and an effectual instrument of action; and because sensible objects are apt strongly to affect our minds; it hath pleased the divine Wisdom to apply them, in fit measure, and to sanctify them to those good purposes, by appointing some few solemn and significant rites to be observed by us, being in their own nature proper and useful, and by God designed to declare his mind and gracious intents to us; to consign and convey his grace into our souls, to confirm our faith in him, to raise our devotion toward him, to quicken our resolutions of obeying his will; to enable and excite us to the practice of those great duties which he requireth of us; 'Our Lord Jesus Christ,' saith St. Austin,* 'hath subjected us to his gentle yoke and light burden; whence, with sacraments most few in number, most easy for observance, most excellent in signification, he bound together the society of new

* Ep. 118. 119.

people :' and, 'The mercy of God,' saith he again, 'would have religion free, by the celebration of a most few and most clear sacraments.'

Of these there appear two (and St. Austin in the place cited could instance in no more) of general and principal use, instituted by our Lord himself; which, because they represent to us somewhat not subject to sense, and have a secret influence on us; because what is intended by them is not immediately discernible by what is done, without some explication, (their significancy being not wholly grounded in the nature, but depending on arbitrary institution, as that of words, which is of kin to them; whence St. Austin calls a sacrament, *verbum visibile*,) have usually been called mysteries, (that is, actions of a close and occult importance, of deeper meaning and design than is obvious to ordinary perception;) and thence are also called sacraments, for no other reason, I conceive, than because the ancientest translators of the Bible into Latin did usually render the word μυστήριον by the word *sacramentum;* whence every thing containing under it somewhat of abstruse meaning is by ancient writers termed a sacrament. (So Tertullian calls all Christianity the sacrament of Christian religion; and Elisha's ax he calls the sacrament of wood; and St. Austin speaks of the sacrament of bread, of fish, of numbers, of the rock, &c. In short, he says of all signs, that 'when they belong to divine things, they are called sacraments;* which shows to how small purpose the disputes are, yea, on what small grounds the decrees are, concerning the number, general nature, and efficacy of sacraments; for where a name or form of a sacrament is of so large, ambiguous, and indeterminate signification, there can be nothing but confusion in the disputes about it.) But those which chiefly at least, and in way of eminency, have obtained this name, are those two instituted by our Lord, Baptism and the Lord's Supper: of which I shall in order discourse; and so of each, as very briefly to consider the occasion of their institution; the actions enjoined in them; the nature of them, or wherein their mystery doth consist; the ends for which they were intended; and the effects they produce; together with the dispositions and duties (antecedent, concomitant, and consequent) required of us in the use and practice of them. And, first,

* Aug. Ep. 5. Leo i. Ep. 4.

OF BAPTISM.

THERE were, as the Apostle to the Hebrews telleth us, in sacred use among the Jews διάφοροι βαπτισμοὶ, 'several kinds of baptisms.' The learned in their laws and customs teach that they never did receive any person into their covenant, whether that which was more strict, (to which natural Jews and proselytes of righteousness were tied,) or that which was more lax, with which strangers and proselytes of the gate did comply, without a baptism. And that priests and Levites entering into their office were to be sanctified by washing with water, we see plainly prescribed in their law; likewise that all persons who had contracted any kind of defilement were purified by the like ceremony, particularly children new born, is expressed there. Moreover, that it was in use for persons, who were conscious to themselves of having transgressed God's law, being in God's name invited by some person of eminent authority (a prophet, or like a prophet, one commissionated by God) unto repentance and amendment of life, to be washed by him, in testimony of their stedfast purpose to amend, and in hope to obtain pardon from God of their past offences, and to be reinstated in his favor, appears probable by St. John the Baptist's undertaking, and the success thereof. For if the manner of his proceeding had been altogether unusual and unknown, so many, it seems, would not so readily (without any stir or obstacle) have complied therewith; especially among the scribes and pharisees, those zealous adherents to traditionary practice, who, to maintain their credit and interest with the people, were so averse from all appearance of novelty. This practice then, of washing in so many cases, and to so many purposes, customary among God's people, to signify men's entering into a new state or course of life, being withal most apt and proper for his design, our blessed Saviour, who never favored needless innovations, was pleased to assume and impose on the disciples and

followers of his religion, accommodating it to those holy purposes, which we shall now endeavor to declare.

What the action itself enjoined is, what the manner and form thereof, is apparent by the words of our Lord's institution; 'Going forth therefore,' saith he, 'teach (or disciple) all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you.'

The action is baptising, or immersing in water; the object thereof, those persons of any nation whom his ministers can by their instruction and persuasion render disciples; that is, such as do sincerely believe the truth of his doctrine, and seriously resolve to obey his commandments. It is performed in the name; that is, it is ministered by the authority, and bears special relation unto the Persons of the blessed Trinity, as the chief objects of the faith possessed, and the sole objects of the obedience undertaken therein; as exhibiting gracious favors unto the person baptised, and as receiving special obligations from him.

Such is the action itself declared to be; the mystery thereof consists in its being a notable sign to represent, and an authentic seal to ratify, the collation then made of certain great benefits to us; and our undertaking correspondent duties toward God.

The benefits which God then signifies, and (on due terms) engageth to confer on us, are these:

1. The purgation or absolution of us from the guilt of past offences, by a free and full remission of them, (the which washing by water, cleansing from all stains, doth most appositely represent;) and consequently God's being reconciled unto us, his receiving us into a state of grace and favor, his freely justifying us, (that is, looking on us, or treating us as just and innocent persons, although before we stood guilty of heinous sins, and thereon liable to grievous punishments,) that these benefits are conferred in baptism, many places of Scripture plainly show; [and the primitive church, with most firm and unanimous consent, did believe.] 'And now,' said Ananias to St. Paul, 'why dost thou tarry? Arise and be baptised, and wash away thy sins:' and, 'Repent,' saith St. Peter, preaching to the Jews, 'and let every one of you be baptised for the remission of sins:' and, 'Christ,' saith St. Paul again to the Ephesians, 'loved his church, and delivered himself for it, that he might sanctify it, purging it by the washing of water,' ἐν ῥήματι, (that is, he effectually in baptism consigned to the members of his church that mercy and remission of sins which

he purchased and merited by his passion:) and again, 'Such,' saith he to the Corinthians, 'were some of you;' (that is, ye were persons guilty of heinous sins;) 'but ye have been washed, ye have been sanctified, ye have been justified in the name of our Lord, and by the Spirit of our God:' where 'having been washed in Christ's name' doth (in congruity with what is said in other places) denote baptism in his name; being sanctified and justified do express the first benefits accompanying that baptism. And indeed, wherever a general remission of sins, or a full sanctification, or consecration, and justification of men's persons in God's sight, are mentioned; that remission of sins, that separation, or dedication unto God's service; that reception into grace, which are consigned in baptism, are (I conceive) understood; there being no other season or occasion, wherein ordinarily and visibly God doth exhibit those benefits.

It may be demanded, how children, by reason of their innocent age, are capable of these benefits; how they can be pardoned who never had offended; how they can be justified who never were capable of being unjust? I briefly answer, that because they come from that race, which by sin had forfeited God's favor, and had alienated itself from him; because also they have in them those seeds of pravity from which afterward certainly, life continuing, (without God's restraining grace,) will sprout forth innumerable evil actions; therefore that God overlooking all the defects of their nature, both relative and absolute, or personal, doth assume them into his special favor, is no small benefit to them, answerable to the remission of actual sin, and restitution from the state consequent thereon in others.

2. In baptism, the gift of God's Holy Spirit is conferred, qualifying us for the state into which we then come, and enabling us to perform the duties we then undertake, which otherwise we should be unable to perform; for purification of our hearts from vicious inclinations and desires; for begetting holy dispositions and affections in our souls; for to guide and instruct us, to sustain and strengthen us, to encourage and comfort us in all the course of Christian piety: the which effects are well also figured by water, which purifieth things both from inherent and adherent filth. That this benefit is annexed to baptism, the Scripture also teacheth us: 'Be baptised,' saith St. Peter, 'in the name of Christ, to the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost:' εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν, 'We being baptised in one body, are made to drink of one Spirit,' saith St. Paul: and with the

laver of regeneration, St. Paul again joineth the renovation of the Holy Ghost: and it is represented as an advantage of our Saviour's baptism above that of John, that our Lord not only baptised 'with water to repentance, but with the Holy Ghost, and fire.'

Some preventing operations of the Holy Ghost (whereby God freely draweth men to Christianity, persuading their minds to assent thereto, inspiring their hearts with resolutions to comply with it) do precede baptism; but a more full communication thereof, (due by compact, assured by promise,) for the confirming and maintaining us in the firm belief and constant practice of Christianity, is consequent thereon; 'After ye had believed, ye were sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise,' saith St. Paul. To signify which benefit then conferred, the ancient Christians did to baptism annex the chrism, or holy unction, signifying the collation of that healing and cheering Spirit to the baptised person; that which St. Paul may seem to respect, when he saith, 'He that establisheth (or confirmeth) us with you into Christ, and who hath anointed us, is God; who also hath sealed us, and hath given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.'

3. With those gifts is connected the benefit of regeneration, implying our entrance into a new state and course of life; being endowed with new faculties, dispositions, and capacities of souls; becoming new creatures and new men, as it were. 'renewed after the likeness of God in righteousness and true holiness;' our being sanctified in our hearts and lives, being mortified to fleshly lusts and worldly affections, being quickened to a spiritual life and heavenly conversation: in short, becoming, in relation and in disposition of mind, the children of God. This the matter and the action of baptism do set out: for as children new born, (for cleansing them from impurities adherent from the womb,) both among the Jews and other people, were wont to be washed; so are we in baptism, signifying our purification from natural and worldly defilements: the mersion also in water, and the emersion thence, doth figure our death to the former, and receiving to a new life. Whence baptism is by St. Paul called 'the laver of regeneration;' and our Lord saith, that 'if a man be not born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;' that is, every one becoming a Christian is by baptism regenerated, or put into a new state of life, getteth new dispositions of soul, and new relations to God: 'Ye are all,' saith St. Paul, 'the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;' that is, by embracing his doctrine, and submitting to his law professedly in

baptism: and, 'We,' saith St. Paul again, 'are buried with Christ through baptism unto death; that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so also we should walk in newness of life.'

4. With these benefits is conjoined that of being inserted into God's church, his family, the number of his chosen people, the mystical body of Christ, whereby we become intitled to the privileges and immunities of that heavenly corporation. 'We,' saith St. Paul, 'have been all baptised in one Spirit into one body,' the mystical body of Christ: and, 'So many of you,' saith he again, 'as have been baptised into Christ, (into Christ mystical, or the church,) have put on Christ; and ye are,' adds he, 'all one in Christ Jesus.' As proselytes among the Jews by baptism were admitted unto the communion and privileges of the Jewish, so thereby are we received into the like communion and privileges of the Christian, far more excellent, society.

5. In consequence of these things, there is with baptism conferred a capacity of, a title unto, an assurance (under condition of persevering in faith and obedience to our Lord) of, eternal life and salvation. We are therein, in St. Peter's words, 'regenerated unto a lively hope of an incorruptible inheritance,' by that resurrection of Christ, which is represented to us in this action; and so therein applied, as to beget in us a title and a hope to rise again in like manner to a blissful life; whence we are said therein to rise with him; 'Being,' saith St. Paul, 'buried with him in baptism, wherein also we were raised again:' whence by the two great Apostles baptism is said to save us: 'Baptism,' saith St. Peter, the antitype of the delivery in the flood, 'doth save us;' that is, admitteth us into the ark, putteth us into the sure way of salvation:' and, 'God,' saith St. Paul, 'according to his mercy saved us, by the laver of regeneration:' and, 'He that shall believe, and shall be baptised, shall be saved,' is our Saviour's own word and promise: 'shall be saved;' that is, shall be put into a state and way of salvation; continuing in which state, proceeding in which way, he assuredly shall be saved: for faith there denoteth perseverance in faith, and baptism implieth performance of the conditions therein undertaken; which next is to be considered.

For as this holy rite signifieth and sealeth God's collation of so many great benefits on us; so it also implieth, and, on our part, ratifieth our obligation, then in an especial manner commencing, to several most important duties toward him. It implieth that we are in mind fully persuaded concerning the

truth of that doctrine which God the Father revealed by his blessed Son, and confirmed by the miraculous operation of the Holy Ghost; we therein profess our humble and thankful embracing the overtures of mercy and grace, purchased for us by our Saviour's meritorious undertaking and performances, the which are then exhibited and tendered to us; we therein declare our hearty resolution to forsake all wicked courses of life, repugnant to the doctrine and law of Christ; fully to conform our lives to his will, living thereafter in all piety, righteousness, and sobriety, as loyal subjects, faithful servants, and dutiful children to God: in brief, we therein are bound, renouncing all erroneous principles, all vicious inclinations, and all other engagements whatever, intirely to devote ourselves to the faith and obedience of God the Father, our glorious and good Maker; of God the Son, our gracious Redeemer; of God the Holy Ghost, our blessed Guide, Assistant, Advocate, and Comforter: these are the duties antecedent unto, and concomitant of, our baptism, (immediately and formally required of those who are capable of performing them, mediately and virtually of them who are not,) the which are signified by our being baptised in the name of the Holy Trinity.

These duties the Scripture commonly expresseth by the word, faith and repentance; sometimes singly, sometimes conjunctly: 'If,' said Philip to the Eunuch, 'thou believest with thy heart, it is lawful' (for thee to be baptised:) faith was an indispensable condition prerequisite thereto: and, 'Repent,' saith St. Peter, 'and let every one of you be baptised;' repentance also was necessary to precede it: indeed both these (as they are meant in this case) do in effect signify the same; each importeth a being renewed in mind, in judgment, in will, in affection; a serious embracing of Christ's doctrine, and a stedfast resolution to adhere thereto in practice. Hence are those effects or consequences attributed to faith, justifying us, reconciling and bringing us near to God, saving us; because it is the necessary condition required by God, and by him accepted; that we may be capable of those benefits conferred in baptism; the same being also referred to that repentance, or change of mind, which must accompany our entrance into Christianity; that good conscience with which we stipulate a perpetual devotion and obedience to God; the which therefore doth, as St. Peter telleth us, save us; it contributing to our salvation, as a duty necessarily required in order thereto. This is that death to sin, and resurrection to righteousness, that being buried with Christ, and rising again with him, so as to walk in newness of life,

which the baptismal action signifies, and which we then really undertake to perform.

And as such are the duties preceding or accompanying baptism; so making good the engagements they contain, constantly persisting in them, maintaining and improving them, are duties necessarily consequent thereon; 'Having,' saith the Apostle, 'had our bodies washed with pure water, let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering.' We should indeed continually remember, frequently and seriously consider, what in so solemn a manner we (on so valuable considerations) did then undertake, promise, and vow to God, diligently striving to perform it; for violating our part of the covenant and stipulation then made, by apostasy in profession or practice from God and goodness, we certainly must forfeit those inestimable benefits which God otherwise hath tied himself to bestow; the pardon of our sins, the favor of God, the being members of Christ, the grace, guidance, assistance, and comfort of the Holy Spirit; the right unto, and hope of, salvation. We so doing, shall not only simply disobey and offend God; but add the highest breach of fidelity to our disobedience, together with the most heinous ingratitude, abusing the greatest grace that could be vouchsafed us; 'If we wilfully sin after we have taken the acknowlegement of the truth,' (saith the Apostle, meaning that solemn profession of our faith in baptism,) 'we trample under foot the Son of God, we profane the blood of the covenant, we do despite unto the Spirit of grace;' and incurring so deep guilt, we must expect suitable punishment. But I proceed to the other sacrament,

THE

EUCHARIST.

AMONG the wonderful works of power and grace performed by God Almighty in favor of the children of Israel, and in order to their delivery from the Egyptian slavery, a most signal one was the smiting the first-born in every house of the Egyptians, and passing over the houses of the children of Israel; wherein God declared his just wrath against their cruel oppressors, depriving them in a sudden and dreadful manner of what was nearest and dearest to them; and his gracious mercy toward them, in preserving what was alike dear to them from so woful a calamity; thus (as the text expresseth it) putting a difference between the Egyptians and the children of Israel. Now that the memory of so remarkable a mercy might be preserved, that their affections might be raised to a strong sense of God's goodness, and their faith in him confirmed, so as in the like need to hope for the same favorable help and protection, by the consideration of so notable an experiment, it pleased God to appoint a sacrament, or mysterious rite, to be annually celebrated, representing and recalling to mind that act of God, wherein his special kindness was so eminently demonstrated toward his people: the same also (as did other rites and sacrifices instituted by God among that people) looking directly forward on that other great delivery from sin and hell, which God in mercy designed toward mankind, to be achieved by our Saviour; prefiguring, that the souls of them who should be willing to forsake the spiritual bondage of sin, should be saved from the ruin coming on them who would abide therein; God regarding the blood of our Saviour (that immaculate Lamb, sacrificed for them) sprinkled on the doors of their houses; that is, by hearty faith and repentance, applied to their consciences. The occasion of celebrating which holy rite, our Saviour we see did improve to the institution of this sacrament, most agreeing therewith in design, as representative and com-

memorative of the greatest blessing and mercy that we are capable of having vouchsafed to us; some part of that ancient rite or sacrifice (which was most suitable to the special purposes of this institution, and most conformable to the general constitution of the Christian religion, whereby all bloody sacrifices are abolished) being retained in this.

The action itself (or rather the whole rite, consisting of divers actions) we see plainly described in the gospels, and in the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, distinguishable into these chief parts. 1. The benediction and consecration (by prayer and thanksgiving) of bread and wine. 2. The breaking of bread, and handling the cup. 3. The delivery and distribution of them to the persons present. 4. The declaration accompanying that delivery, that those symbolical things and actions did represent our Saviour's body given and broken, our Saviour's blood shed and poured out for us, in sanction of the new covenant. 5. The actual partaking of those symbols, by eating the bread and drinking the wine, done by all present. These things we find done at the first institution and exemplary practice of this holy ceremony; the which our Saviour obliged us to imitate, saying, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' There followeth in St. Matthew and St. Mark, presently after the narration concerning these particulars,—Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες, 'And having sung a hymn, they went to the mount of Olives:' which action was indeed in itself proper to conclude the practice of this holy rite; yet what reference it hath thereto cannot thence be determined: however, with these the church hath always joined several acts of devotion (confessions, prayers, praises, thanksgivings, intercessions, vows) suitable to the nature and design of the sacrament, apt to glorify God, and edify the faithful in the celebration thereof.

Such is the practice itself instituted and enjoined by our Saviour; the mysterious importance thereof, as we find it explained in holy Scripture, (the only solid and sure ground on which we can build the explication of supernatural mysteries,) consisteth chiefly in these particulars:

1. It was intended for a commemorative representation of our Saviour's passion for us; fit to mind us of it, to move us to consider it, to beget affections in us suitable to the memory and consideration thereof: Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· 'Do this,' saith our Lord, 'for my remembrance,' or in commemoration of me; that is, so as thereby to have raised in you a reflexion of mind and heart on those grievous pains which I shall have endured for your sake, to procure for you a remission of sins and reconciliation to God: and, 'So often,' saith St.

Paul, 'as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, καταγγέλλετε, ye tell forth (or significantly express) the death of our Lord till he come,' or during his absence from us. The suffering of our Saviour (the most wonderful act of goodness and charity that ever was performed in the world, which produced effects of highest consequence to our benefit, the consideration whereof is apt to work the best dispositions of piety in us) should very frequently be present to our thoughts and affections; and that it may be so with advantage, such a solemn and sensible representation thereof is very conducible; wherein we behold him crucified, as it were in effigy, his body broken, his blood poured out for us; it being, in a sort, a putting us into the circumstances of those who did behold our Saviour for us hanging on the cross. Our Lord being absent in body from us, (sitting in heaven at God's right hand,) to supply that absence, that we should not be apt to forget him, and thereby become wholly estranged from him, is pleased to order this occasion of being present, and conversing with us, in such a manner, as may retain in our memories his gracious performances for us; may impress in our hearts a kindly sense of them; may raise us up in mind and affection to him.

2. The benefits consequent on our Saviour's passion, rightly apprehended, heartily believed, seriously considered by us, are hereby livelily represented, and effectually conveyed, to the sustenance and nourishment of our spiritual life, to the refreshment and comfort of our souls. It is a holy feast, a spiritual repast, a divine entertainment, to which God in kindness invites us; to which, if we come with well-disposed minds, he there feeds us with most holy and delicious viands, with heavenly manna, with most reviving and cherishing liquor. Bread is the staff of life, the most common, most necessary, and most wholesome, and most savory meat; wine is the most pleasant and wholesome also, the most sprightly and cordial drink: by them therefore our Lord chose to represent that body and blood, by the oblation of which a capacity of life and health was procured to mankind; the taking in which by right apprehension, tasting it by hearty faith, digesting it by careful attention and meditation, converting it into our substance by devout, grateful, and holy affections, joined with serious and steady resolutions of living answerable thereto, will certainly support and maintain our spiritual life in a vigorous health and happy growth of grace; refreshing our hearts with comfort and satisfaction unspeakable; 'He that doeth thus, eats our Saviour's flesh, and drinks his blood,' (that is, who, as our Saviour interpreteth it, doth believe in him; that belief im-

porting all other acts of mind and will connected with right persuasions concerning him,) hath eternal life, and shall live for ever, as himself declares and promises: which benefits therefore, in the due performance of this holy duty, are conveyed unto us.

3. This sacrament declares that union which good Christians partaking thereof have with Christ; their mystical insertion into him, by a close dependence on him for spiritual life, mercy, grace, and salvation; a constant adherence to him by faith and obedience; a near conformity to him in mind and affection; an inseparable conjunction with him, by the strictest bands of fidelity, and by the most endearing relations: which things could not more fitly be set out, than by the partaking our best and most necessary food; which being taken in, soon becomes united to us, assimilated and converted into our substance; thereby renewing our strength, and repairing the decays of our nature: wherefore, 'He,' saith our Saviour, 'that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him;' and, 'The cup of blessing,' saith St. Paul, 'which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' We in the outward action partake of the symbols representing our Saviour's body and blood; we in the spiritual intention communicate of his very person, being (according to the manner insinuated) intimately united to him.

4. By this sacrament consequently is signified and sealed that union which is among our Saviour's true disciples communicating therein; their being together united in consent of mind and unity of faith; in mutual good-will and affection, in hope, and tendency to the same blessed end, in spiritual brotherhood and society; especially on account of their communion with Christ, which most closely ties them one to another; they partaking of this one individual food, become translated, as it were, into one body and substance; 'Seeing,' saith St. Paul, 'we being many, are one bread, one body; for all of us do partake of one bread.'

In the representing, producing, and promoting these things, we are taught the mystery of this sacrament doth consist; it was designed, as a proper and efficacious instrument, to raise in us pious affections toward our good God and gracious Redeemer; to dispose us to all holy practice; to confirm our faith, to nourish our hope, to quicken our resolutions of walking carefully in the ways of duty; to unite us more fastly to our Saviour, and to combine us in charity one toward another; the accomplishing of which intents thereof doth suppose our faithful and

diligent concurrence in the use thereof: whence arise many duties incumbent on us in respect thereto; some antecedent, some concomitant, some consequent to the use thereof.

1. Before we address ourselves to the partaking of this venerable mystery, we should consider whither we are going, what is the nature and importance of the action we set ourselves about; that we are approaching 'to our Lord's table,' (so St. Paul calleth it,) to come into his more especial presence, to be entertained by him with the dearest welcome and the best cheer that can be; to receive the fullest testimonies of his mercy, and the surest pledges of his favor toward us; that we are going to behold our Lord in tenderest love, offering up himself a sacrifice to God, therein undergoing the sorest pains and foulest disgraces for our good and salvation; that we ought therefore to bring with us dispositions of soul suitable to such an access unto, such an intercourse with, our gracious Lord. Had we the honor and favor to be invited to the table of a great prince, what especial care should we have to dress our bodies in a clean and decent garb, to compose our minds in order to expression of all due respect to him; to bring nothing about us noisome or ugly, that might offend his sight, or displease his mind: the like, surely, and greater care we should apply, when we, thus being called, do go into God's presence and communion. We should, in preparation thereto, with all our power, endeavor to cleanse our souls from all impurity of thought and desire; from all iniquity and perverseness; from all malice, envy, hatred, anger, and all such evil dispositions, which are most offensive to God's all-piercing sight, and unbeseeming his glorious presence; we should dress our souls with all those comely ornaments of grace (with purity, humility, meekness, and charity) which will render us acceptable and well-pleasing to him; we should compose our minds into a frame of reverence and awful regard to the majesty of God; into a lowly, calm, and tender disposition of heart, apt to express all respect due to his presence, fit to admit the gracious illapses of his Holy Spirit; very susceptive of all holy and heavenly affections, which are suitable to such a communion, or may spring from it. We should therefore remove and abandon from us, not only all vicious inclinations and evil purposes; but even all worldly cares, desires, and passions, which may distract or discompose us, that may dull or deject us, that may cause us to behave ourselves indecently or unworthily before God, that may bereave us of the excellent fruits from so blessed an entertainment.

To these purposes we should, according to St. Paul's advice, δοκιμάζειν ἑαυτοὺς, examine and approve ourselves; considering our past actions and our present inclinations; and accordingly, by serious meditation, and fervent prayer to God for his gracious assistance therein, working our souls into a hearty remorse for our past miscarriages, and a sincere resolution to amend for the future; forsaking all sin, endeavoring in all our actions to serve and please God; 'purging out,' as St. Paul again enjoineth us, 'the old leaven of vice and wickedness;' so that we may feast, and celebrate this passover, in which Christ is mystically sacrificed for us, in the unleavened dispositions of sincerity and truth. Such are the duties previous to our partaking this sacrament.

2. Those duties which accompany it are, a reverent and devout affection of heart, with a suitable behavior therein; an awful sense of mind, befitting the majesty of that presence wherein we do appear, answerable to the greatness, and goodness, and holiness of him with whom we converse, becoming the sacredness of those mysteries which are exhibited to us, (that which St. Paul seemeth to call διακρίνειν τὸ σῶμα Κυρίου, to discern or distinguish our Lord's body; that is, yielding a peculiar reverence of mind and behavior in regard thereto;) a devotion of heart, consisting in hearty contrition for our sins, which did expose our Saviour to the enduring such pains, then remembered; in firm resolution to forsake the like thereafter, as injurious, dishonorable, and displeasing to him; in fervent love of him, as full of so wonderful goodness and charity toward us; in most hearty thankfulness for those unconceivably great expressions of kindness toward us; in deepest humility, on sense of our unworthiness to receive such testimonies of grace and favor from him, (our unworthiness 'to eat the crumbs that fall from his table;' how much more to be admitted into such degrees of honorable communion and familiarity, of close conjunction and union with him!) of pious joy in consideration of the excellent privileges herein imparted, and of the blessed fruits accruing to us from his gracious performances; in a comfortable hope of obtaining and enjoying the benefits of his obedience and passion, by the assistance of his grace; in steady faith and full persuasion of mind, that he is (supposing our dutiful compliance) ready to bestow on us all the blessings then exhibited; in attentively fixing the eyes of our mind, and all the powers of our soul (our understanding, will, memory, fancy, affection) on him, as willingly pouring forth his life for our salvation; lastly, in motions of enlarged good-will and cha-

rity toward all our brethren for his sake, in obedience to his will, and in imitation of him: such like duties should attend our participation of this holy sacrament.

3. The effects of having duly performed which, should appear in the practice of those duties which are consequent thereon; being such as these: an increase of all pious inclinations and affections, expressing themselves in a real amendment of our lives, and producing more goodly fruits of obedience; the thorough digestion of that spiritual nourishment, by our becoming more fastly knit to our Saviour by higher degrees of faith and love; the maintaining a more lively sense of his superabundant goodness; the cherishing those influences of grace which descend on our hearts in this communion, and improving them to nearer degrees of perfection in all piety and virtue; a watchful care and endeavor in our lives to approve ourselves in some measure worthy of that great honor and favor which God hath vouchsafed us in admitting us to so near approaches to himself; an earnest pursuance of the resolutions, performance of the vows, making good the engagements, which in so solemn a manner, on so great an occasion, we made, and offered up unto our God and Saviour; finally, the considering that by the breach of such resolutions, by the violation of such engagements, our sins receiving so mighty aggravation of vain inconstancy and wicked perfidiousness, our guilt will hugely be increased; our souls relapsing into so grievous distemper, our spiritual strength will be exceedingly impaired; consequently hence our true comforts will be abated, our best hopes will be shaken, our eternal state will be desperately endangered.

There is one duty which I should not forbear to touch concerning this sacrament; that is, our gladly embracing any opportunity presented of communicating therein; the doing so being not only our duty, but a great aid and instrument of piety; the neglecting it a grievous sin, and productive of great mischiefs to us.

The primitive Christians did very frequently use it, partaking therein, as it seems, at every time of their meeting for God's service; it is said of them by St. Luke, that 'they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and communion, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers;' and, 'when you meet together, it is not (as according to the intent and duty of meeting it should be) to eat the Lord's Supper,' saith St. Paul: and Justin Martyr in his second Apology, describing the religious service of God in their assemblies, mentioneth it as a constant part thereof; and Epiphanius reporteth it a custom in the church, derived from apostolical institution, to celebrate the

Eucharist thrice every week, that is, so often as they did meet to pray and praise God; which practice may well be conceived a great means of kindling and preserving in them that holy fervor of piety, which they so illustriously expressed in their conversation, and in their gladsome suffering for Christ's sake: and the remitting of that frequency, as it is certainly a sign and an effect, so in part it may possibly be reckoned a cause, of the degeneracy of Christian practice, into that great coldness and slackness which afterward did seize on it, and now doth apparently keep it in a languishing and half-dying state.

The rarer occasions therefore we now have of performing this duty, (the which indeed was always esteemed the principal office of God's service,) of enjoying this benefit, (the being deprived whereof was also deemed the greatest punishment and infelicity that could arrive to a Christian,) the more ready we should be to embrace them. If we dread God's displeasure, if we value our Lord and his benefits, if we tender the life, health, and welfare of our souls, we shall not neglect it; for how can we but extremely offend God by so extreme rudeness, that when he kindly invites us to his table, we are averse from coming thither, or utterly refuse it? that when he calleth us into his presence, we run from him? that when he, with his own hand, offereth us inestimable mercies and blessings, we reject them? It is not only the breach of God's command, who enjoined us to do this, but a direct contempt of his favor and goodness, most clearly and largely exhibited in this office. And how can we bear any regard to our Lord, or be anywise sensible of his gracious performances in our behalf, if we are unwilling to join in thankful and joyful commemoration of them? How little do we love our own souls, if we suffer them to pine and starve for want of that food which God here dispenseth for their sustenance and comfort? if we bereave them of enjoying so high a privilege, so inestimable a benefit, so incomparable pleasures as are to be found and felt in this service, or do spring and flow from it? what reasonable excuse can we frame for such neglect? Are we otherwise employed? what business can there be more important, than serving God, and saving our own souls? is it wisdom, in pursuance of any the greatest affair here, to disregard the principal concern of our souls? Do we think ourselves unfit and unworthy to appear in God's presence? But is any man unworthy to obey God's commands? Is any man unfit to implore and partake of God's mercy, if he be not unwilling to do it? What unworthiness should hinder us from remembering our Lord's excessive charity towards us, and thanking him for it? from praying for his

grace; from resolving to amend our lives? Must we, because we are unworthy, continue so still, by shunning the means of correcting and curing us? Must we increase our unworthiness, by transgressing our duty? If we esteem things well, the conscience of our sinfulness should rather drive us to it, as to our medicine, than detain us from it. There is no man indeed who must not conceive and confess himself unworthy; therefore must no man come thither at God's call? If we have a sense of our sins, and a mind to leave them; if we have a sense of God's goodness, and a heart to thank him for it; we are so worthy, that we shall be kindly received there, and graciously rewarded. If we will not take a little care to work these dispositions in us, we are indeed unworthy; but the being so, from our own perverse negligence, is a bad excuse for the neglect of our duty. In fine, I dare say, that he who, with an honest meaning, (although with an imperfect devotion,) doth address himself to the performance of this duty, is far more excusable than he that on whatever score declineth it; no scrupulous shyness can ward us from blame; what then shall we say, if supine sloth, or profane contempt, are the causes of such neglect?

Ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ ὡς ἔτυχε προσιέναι κίνδυνος, οὕτω τὸ μὴ κοινωνεῖν τῶν μυστικῶν δείπνων ἐκείνων, λιμὸς καὶ θάνατος. Αὕτη γὰρ ἡ τράπεζα τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν τὰ νεύρα, τῆς διανοίας ὁ σύνδεσμος, τῆς παῤῥησίας ἡ ὑπόθεσις, ἡ ἐλπὶς, ἡ σωτηρία, τὸ φῶς, ἡ ζωή. Chrys. in 1 *Cor. Or.* 24.

Thus having briefly dispatched the considerations that offered themselves on these subjects, I shall conclude all with prayer to Almighty God, that we, by his grace and help, believing rightly, strongly, constantly, and finally; being frequent and fervent in prayer, and all pious devotion; sincerely obeying all God's commandments; continuing orderly, dutiful, and worthy members of Christ's Church, growing continually in grace, by the worthy participation of the holy sacraments, may obtain the end of our faith, the success of our prayers, the reward of our obedience, the continuance in that holy society, the perfect consummation of grace in the possession of eternal joy, glory, and bliss; which God in his infinite mercy grant to us, for our blessed Saviour's sake; to whom be all glory and praise for ever and ever. Amen.

SUMMARY OF A TREATISE

OF THE

POPE'S SUPREMACY.

INTRODUCTION.

I. Boast of the Roman party in the points of unity, certainty of doctrine, decision of controversies, &c. Yet in matters of great importance it is hard to descry how they agree, or of what they are certain. Many of their laws and rites shown to have been drawn from divers authorities. Disagreement among the Roman doctors concerning the nature and extent of Papal authority; so that in the Council of Trent the agitation of that question was not permitted: reasons of this.

II. There are among them some, who ascribe to the Pope an universal, absolute empire, over all persons and in all matters, conferred on him by Divine immutable sanction. Authors quoted who acknowlege this power.

III. The opinion of Bellarmine, given as the general opinion of Catholics, does not differ in effect from this, though veiled and disguised by words.

IV. Such an universal power hath been claimed by divers Popes, successively, for many ages. Instances quoted at great length.

V. This doctrine may reasonably be supposed the sentiment of all Popes continually for more than five hundred years to the present day. Reasons for this alleged.

VI. All Romanists, consistently with their principles, seem obliged to hold it: this shown.

VII. Yet so loose and slippery are the principles of the

party, that many in communion with the Roman Catholic Church will not allow this doctrine of the Pope's universal and absolute power: this point enlarged on.

VIII. Neither are the adherents of the Roman Church more agreed concerning the extent of the Pope's authority, even in spiritual affairs: this shown.

IX. No wonder that their doctrine in this matter is various and uncertain, since interest is concerned in it, and principles are defective towards the resolution of it.

X. Even Popes themselves have shifted their pretences, and varied in style, according to circumstances, &c. This shown.

XI. Hence a statement of this question is not difficult, and the mark to which this discourse should be levelled is plain.

XII. But on account of the preceding observations, all discussion of the Pope's temporal dominion is omitted; his ecclesiastical authority alone being canvassed.

XIII. And here the doctrine contested against is that, in which the cordial partisans of the Papacy, &c. do seem to consent.

XIV. This doctrine of absolute power explained, in the words of the Florentine Synod's definition, &c.

XV. It is known that many within the Roman communion contract the Papal sovereignty within narrower limits: the doctrine of many such stated.

XVI. Nevertheless, the former opinion seems to be the genuine doctrine of the Roman Church, if it has any: this enlarged on.

XVII. No distinct regard therefore will be paid to the opinion of these semi-Romanists, except in part. Discourse levelled at the Pope, as he pretends to be, absolute in authority.

XVIII. Of such vast pretences we have reason to require sufficient grounds; this shown.

XIX. Such demands they cannot wholly baulk, and therefore they call in St. Peter; which plea of theirs involves the following main suppositions:

I. That St. Peter had by our Lord's appointment a primacy over the Apostles.

II. That St. Peter's primacy, with its rights and prero-

gatives, was not personal, but derivable and transmitted to his successors.

III. That St. Peter was bishop of Rome.

IV. That St. Peter did continue bishop of Rome after his translation, and was so at his decease.

V. That the bishops of Rome (according to God's institution, and by original right derived thence) should have an universal supremacy and jurisdiction over the Christian church.

VI. That in fact the Roman bishops continually from St. Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this sovereign power.

VII. That this ower is indefectible and unalterable.

TREATISE, &c.

MATTHEW, CHAP. X.—VERSE 2.

IMPORTANCE of this controversy. The suppositions on which it rests on the side of the Romanists, re-stated.

SUPPOSITION I.—*In order to the resolution of this point, we may consider that there are several kinds of primacy: these enumerated, and the title which St. Peter might have to each.*

1. *A primacy of worth*, or personal excellency. Various personal endowments, natural and moral, enumerated, in which it may be granted that St. Peter possessed this superiority over the other disciples; though one afterwards arose who can hardly be called inferior to him.

2. *A primacy of repute;* which St. Paul means in Gal. ii. 2. 6. 9.; 2 Cor. xi. 5. &c. Nor can this advantage, consequent on the preceding, be refused him.

3. *A primacy of order, or bare dignity.* This probably may have been conceded to him, for use and convenience. Various reasons for this probability stated.

4. *A primacy, importing superiority in power, command,*

or jurisdiction. This asserted by the Romanists: but we have great reason to deny it, from the following considerations: that such a power ought to be *conspicuously* and *clearly* instituted, &c.: there is no express mention of it; no time for its institution can be assigned: it would probably have been indicated by some *title* or *name:* there was indeed no office above that of an Apostle known to the disciples, or the primitive church: our Lord himself several times declared against such superiority: in surveying particulars we shall not find any peculiar jurisdiction, &c. conferred on St. Peter, which was not on the other Apostles—no intimation of it in the Catholic Epistles of St. Peter—none in the apostolical history—none in any incidental controversies relating to doctrine or practice, where we should expect an appeal made to him: the proceedings of the Apostles in converting people, in founding churches, and in administering special affairs, exclude it: nature of the apostolical office, state of things, and manner of St. Peter's life; whence he will appear uncapable, or unfit to manage such a jurisdiction: it was requisite that every Apostle should have a complete, absolute, independent authority in the affairs of his office; in particular, the discourse and behavior of St. Paul to St. Peter shows that he acknowleged no dependence on him. If St. Peter had been appointed sovereign of the Church, it seems requisite that he should have outlived all the other Apostles. On the same grounds with St. Peter, other Apostles might have challenged a superiority over their brethren, &c. The Fathers both in express terms, and by inference, assert the co-equality of the Apostles: none of them mention the superiority of St. Peter. The last argument here used against this *primacy* is the insufficiency of those arguments and testimonies which are produced to prove it.

I. The words of our Saviour are alleged, *Thou art Peter*, &c.: where, it is said, St. Peter is declared to be the foundation, that is, the sole supreme governor of the Church. Answers to this given; by which it is shown, 1. that those words are metaphorical, &c.; which sense, 2. is confirmed by the Fathers and ancient divines: 3. that the Apostles did not understand them literally: 4. that a literal interpretation does not suit our Lord's answers to the contests and inquiries of his

disciples: 5. that even literally the words *a rock* do not imply government: 6. it is not said that the Apostles or apostolical office should be built on him: 7. if St. Peter himself be taken for *the rock*, then the best import of the words is, that our Lord designed him for a prime instrument in the support and propagation of the gospel: 8. St. Peter, before these words were spoken by our Lord, may seem to have had a primacy, intimated by the Evangelists, &c.; and therefore it cannot be founded on this place.

II. The next words, spoken in the sequel by our Lord, are alleged; *to thee will I give the keys*, &c.; that is, supreme power over the Church.

To this divers answers are given: 1. these words are figurative: 2. they admit and have admitted various interpretations: 3. the Apostles did not so understand them: 4. they cannot be taken as excluding others: 5. the Fathers affirm that all the Apostles received the same keys: 6. whatever the phrase imports, it is shown plainly to have belonged to them all: 7. many of the Fathers suppose the words apply to St. Peter, not as a single person, but as a representative of the Church: 8. these answers confirmed by the words which immediately follow: 9. if we grant any thing peculiar to St. Peter, it can only be that he should be a prime instrument in propagating the gospel, &c.: 10. it is absurd that he should exercise this power of the keys in respect of the *Apostles:* 11. the words explained by a reference to Luke v. 10. and Matt. iv. 19.

III. Those words of our Saviour are also produced, *feed my sheep;* that is, be universal governor of my Church.

To this allegation it is answered, 1. these words might have properly been said to any Christian pastor; no peculiar privilege to St. Peter therefore can be deduced from them: 2. from indefinite words, a definite conclusion cannot be drawn: 3. by them no new power is assuredly instituted by our Lord; for the Apostles had a similar command before: 4. they seem only admonitory or exhortative: 5. the same office which they express, belonged evidently to all the Apostles: 6. St. Peter's charge could not be more extensive than that of the others: this shown: 7. the words are applicable to all Christian bishops and governors of the Church: opinions of the Fathers: 8. the

sheep therefore were not the Apostles, but the common believers or people of God, called by St. Peter *the flock of God*: 9. take *feeding* for what you please, the Apostles were not fit objects of it: 10. if St. Peter was obliged *solely* to feed all Christ's sheep, he must have had an impossible task.

IV. The Romanists, in confirmation of this doctrine, produce a shoal of testimonies to divers prerogatives, as they are called, of St. Peter. These enumerated; for example, his change of name; his walking on the sea; his miraculous draught of fish, &c. &c. These answered by similar ones indicating the *primacy* of St. John.

V. They argue from the constant placing of St. Peter's name before the other Apostles in catalogues and narrations concerning him and them.

Answers: 1. this order is not so strict as to admit no exceptions: 2. still position of names does not imply degree, or superiority of power: 3. other sufficient causes have been assigned why St. Peter had this place.

VI. Farther, and most plausibly, they allege the titles and eulogies given to St. Peter by the Fathers: such enumerated.

Answers: 1. we might say that we are not accountable for all their flourishes, &c.: 2. such are not found in the *more ancient* Fathers: 3. they are ambiguous, and applicable to any kind of supremacy: 4. and so they are sometimes explained by the writers themselves: 5. moreover, those that give these titles to St. Peter expressly declare other Apostles equal to him in power and dignity: 6. if Leo I., or any other ancient Pope, seems to mean farther, we may except against his opinion as singular, and partial towards his see: 7. the ancients, when their subject allures them, adorn other Apostles with like titles: instances quoted.

SUPPOSITION II.—*That St. Peter's primacy, with its rights and prerogatives, was not personal only, but derivable to his successors.*

Admitting St. Peter's *primacy*, the rest does not follow.

A rule of the Canon Law; *that a personal privilege follows*

the person, and is extinguished with the person: and such is that of St. Peter: for,

1. His primacy was grounded on personal acts, personal graces, gifts, endowments, &c.

2. All pretence of primacy granted to St. Peter is grounded on words directed to his person, characterised by most personal adjuncts, &c.

3. Particularly the grand promise of founding the Church on him cannot reach beyond his person.

4. The Apostolical office, as such, was personal and temporary, and therefore not successive; &c.

5. Accordingly, since the other Apostles, as such, had no successors, so any primacy of St. Peter did cease with him.

6. If some privileges of St. Peter were derived to Popes, why were not all?

7. Answer to the objection that the Fathers commonly call bishops successors of the Apostles.

8. It may be said that not one single bishop, but all bishops together do succeed St. Peter, or any other Apostle.

9. This the notion which St. Cyprian so much insists on. Also the Synod of Carthage, and St. Chrysostom; who says that *the sheep of Christ were committed to him by St. Peter, and to those after him.*

10. Such, and no other power, St. Peter might devolve on any bishop ordained by him in any church; and such did the other Apostles communicate.

11. Consequently, in those churches, whereof the Apostles were never accounted bishops, yet the bishops are called successors of the Apostles, &c.

12. The pretence, that the other Apostles had an extraordinary charge, which had no succession, but that St. Peter had a peculiar one, as pastor of the whole church which survives, is shown to be a mere figment or shift.

13. If such power had existed, we should have had some authentic record of the same.

14. It would also surely have been mentioned in the Fathers.

SUPPOSITION III.—*That St. Peter was bishop of Rome.*

This may with great reason be denied: and it may be said,

1. That St. Peter's being bishop of Rome would confound the offices which God made distinct.

2. The offices of Apostle and bishop shown to be not in their nature consistent.

3. It would not have been decorous in St. Peter, the prime Apostle, to have assumed the charge of a particular bishop.

4. It was not likely that St. Peter, sensible of a superior charge belonging to him, would have undertaken an inferior one.

5. His general charge of converting and inspecting the Jews dispersed over the world, would not well agree with the other.

6. The consideration of his life will show him incapable of this office.

7. It was needless that he should be bishop, as he might, whenever he was at Rome, by virtue of his Apostleship exercise episcopal authority.

8. Had he been such, he would have set a bad example of non-residence, &c.

9. He would also have offended against many other good ecclesiastical rules.

10. It was against rule that a bishop of one church should be bishop of another. Now St. Peter is admitted by Romanists to have been bishop of Antioch for seven years together.

11. It was anciently deemed a very irregular thing, and denounced by synods and Popes, that there should be two bishops of one place. But the same authority which makes St. Peter bishop of Rome reckons St. Paul bishop of the same: this shown.

SUPPOSITION IV.—*That St. Peter did continue bishop of Rome after his translation, and did continue so to his decease.*

Against which assertions the following considerations are offered. 1. Ecclesiastical writers affirm that St. Peter (either alone, or together with St. Paul) did constitute other bishops;

wherefore he never was bishop, or did not continue bishop there: instances given.

2. Even on the supposition that he was bishop, he could not well lay down his office, and subrogate another, according to the ancient rules of discipline: this shown.

3. Supposing him to have been bishop once, yet by the constitution of Linus or Clemens in his place, he ceased to be so, and divested himself of his office.

4. In fine, when St. Peter ordained others, either he did retain the episcopacy, and then there were concurrently divers bishops of Rome at the same time; or he did finally relinquish the office himself.

5. To avoid all which difficulties, it is reasonable to understand those ancient authors, who call St. Peter bishop of Rome, as meaning that he was bishop or superintendent of that Church in a large sense: this explained.

6. This notion confirmed by divers observations.

7. It is also remarkable that in the recensions of the Roman bishops, sometimes the Apostles are reckoned in, sometimes excluded: instances given.

8. Divers churches were called *Apostolical Thrones*, or *Chairs*, not because the Apostles did sit as bishops there, but for other reasons mentioned: instances given.

9. The author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, reciting the first bishops of several churches, does not reckon any of the Apostles.

10. Again, any Apostle, wherever he resided, was qualified by his office to preside there and exercise a full authority: it was needless therefore for him to take the character of a bishop.

11. It may possibly be alleged that St. James, our Lord's near kinsman, although he was an Apostle, was made bishop of Jerusalem, &c. Answers to this objection.

SUPPOSITION V.—*That by consequence, the bishops of Rome, according to God's institution, and by original right derived thence, should have an universal supremacy and jurisdiction over the Christian Church.*

This assertion shown to be very uncertain, or rather most false, by various considerations.

1. If any of the former suppositions be uncertain or false, this, standing on such ground, must partake of the same defects.

2. Even admitting all those suppositions, the inference from them is not assuredly valid. Even if St. Peter had an universal supremacy, this at his decease might be transferred to the ecclesiastical college of bishops, and of the church, whilst his episcopal and inferior authority over the province of Rome was transmitted to his followers in that chair.

3. And that such was the case is the general opinion of the ancient Fathers, councils, &c.

4. The bishops of any other churches founded by the Apostles, in the Fathers' style are successors of the Apostles, just as the bishop of Rome is by them accounted successor of St. Peter; yet they never claimed jurisdiction beyond their provinces.

5. This instanced in the case of St. James, bishop of Jerusalem, and his successors.

6. St. Peter, before he came to Rome, probably founded other churches, *as Antioch was anciently his see.* Why then might not the elder bishop of Antioch pretend to succeed St. Peter in his universal supremacy?

7. It is said that the ground of this preference in the case of Rome, was St. Peter's will; but where is that will to be found?

8. Bellarmine asserts that *God did command St. Peter to fix his see at Rome;* but the proofs of this are weak and ridiculous.

9. Antioch indeed has a fair plea; for it ever held the repute of an Apostolical church; and on that score some deference was paid to it: but would this have been done, if St.

Peter had transferred his see and all its prerogatives to another place?

10. Other persons also might have been found, who, according to equal judgment, had a far better title to succeed Peter in his universal supremacy than the Pope; St. John, for example, or any other Apostle.

11. The bishop of Jerusalem, in particular, might have put in his claim as being successor to our Lord himself, &c.

12. Equity itself would rather have required that a successor, by election of the whole church, should have been appointed, &c.

13. If God had designed this derivation of universal sovereignty, it is probable that he would have prescribed some certain, standing rule of election, &c.

14. From the premises, to conclude the Pope's title to St. Peter's authority, it is requisite to show that the power demised by him is according to God's institution and intent, immutable and indefectible.

15. That God did intend his Church to subsist perpetually united in any one political frame of government, is assumed by the Romanists, but not proved.

16. Really the sovereign power (such as is pretended) hath often failed; and for a long time there have been no Roman bishops at all; which is a sign that the Church may subsist without it: instances quoted.

Some arguments are next levelled at the main conclusion of the Romanists.

I. Their pretence is destitute of any good warrant, either from divine or human testimony: this shown from various considerations.

1. The want of God's declared will, &c. 2. Such institution unnoticed by the Evangelists. 3. No precept relating to it in Scripture. 4. They who so carefully exhort men to honor and obey the temporal authority, why do they forget the spiritual? 5. Neglect of St. Peter in particular, who was most interested. 6. Also of St. Paul. 7. How comes it even that tradition is here so defective? 8. Also ecclesiastical history? 9. Why is it inserted in no ancient summary? 10. Why in no ancient

exposition of the Creed, no catechetical discourse of Cyril, Ambrose, &c., no system of Divinity by St. Austin, Lactantius, &c.? 11. Why is this point defined by no ancient synod? 12. If it had been so, it would not have been overlooked by the negligence of Popes. 13. Whereas some persons disclaimed this authority, why are not such reckoned in the large catalogues of heretics? 14. Is it not strange that no Pagans should loudly exclaim against it? Reasons why it would be likely to move their indignation. 15. One would wonder that Constantine, if he had smelt such a doctrine in Christianity, should have been so ready to embrace it. 16. Absence of it in the Apostolical Canons, and the Constitutions of Clement. 17. Not mentioned by the old writer, under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. 18. Nor by Ignatius. 19. We have many letters from and to Popes, in which it is not assumed, nor given. 20. Not mentioned in the epistle of Clemens Romanus. 21. Nor in the epistles of St. Cyprian to several Popes, or in those of many others here quoted. 22. Neither is it brought forward in disputes managed by the Fathers against heretics. 23. And though many of those Fathers purposely treat on methods of converting heretics, it is strange that none of them hit on this method of deciding points in question. 24. Tertullian in such cases recommends the authority of the Churches, but not this. 25. Both he and Irenæus produce the Roman Church as a principal authority; but what is this to its bishop's judicial power? 26. Even Popes themselves in elaborate tracts against heretics content themselves with urging testimonies of Scripture and arguments thence deduced; but never their own definitive authority. 27. It is matter of wonder, if the Pope were such as he is represented, that this supreme power of his should not be noticed in so many bulky volumes of ecclesiastical writers. 28. It is monstrous that there should not be one canon, in the code of the Catholic Church, directly declaring his authority.

II. It is next shown that this pretence, on several accounts, is contrary to the doctrine of Holy Scripture.

1. It thwarts the Scripture, by assigning to another the prerogatives and peculiar titles appropriated therein to our Lord: instances given. 2. It accords not with Scripture, in that it

transforms the Church from a spiritual society, as it was constituted by God, into a worldly frame of policy, &c. 3. It thwarts Scripture by destroying that brotherly co-ordination and equality, which our Lord appointed among the bishops and chief pastors of his Church: 4. also by not only trampling down the dignity of bishops, but infringing the rights granted by our Lord to his Church, and to its governors: this shown. 5. Also by robbing all Christian people of the liberties and rights with which by the divine charter of Scripture they are endowed, and which they are obliged to keep inviolate: this explained. 6. In particular it thwarts Scripture by wronging princes, and pretending to govern their subjects without their leave, &c.

III. Farther, since the Romanists little regard any allegagation of Scripture against them, it must still be observed that this their pretence crosses also tradition, and the common doctrine of the Fathers. For,

1. Common usage (which is a good interpreter of right) shows that no such right was known in the primitive church. 2. Its state indeed did not allow of such. 3. The Fathers supposed no order in the church, by original right or divine institution, higher than a bishop: this shown, and enlarged on.

IV. Moreover, this pretence may be impugned by many abstract arguments, showing that such an authority could not be practicable without much iniquity and injury to the interests of religion and the welfare of mankind.

1. The Christian Church (especially in the extended limits which we expect it to obtain) is far too immense and unwieldy for the inspection and guidance of one person: this fully shown. 2. Such an authority as this pretence claims, must necessarily (if not withheld by a continual miracle) throw the Church into sad bondage: this explained. 3. It would also necessarily produce a depravation of Christian doctrine, in the promotion of its worldly designs and interests. 4. Such errors in doctrine, and miscarriages in practice, would be established immovably, to the irrevocable oppression of truth and piety: there would exist no hope of reformation. 5. This authority would also produce a general depravation of manners: 6. which it would moreover perpetuate, thereby rendering the state of things incorrigible. 7. It would also spoil him in whom it was seated,

corrupting his morals, and rendering him a scandal to religion. 8. This pretence, on many obvious accounts, is apt to create great mischief in the world, to the disturbance of civil societies, and to the destruction of temporal authority, which is certainly of God's ordinance: this fully shown. 9. Consequently it is apt to engage Christian princes against Christianity. 10. Whereas Christendom is now split into many parcels, subject to various civil authorities, it is expedient that there should be distinct, independent, ecclesiastical governments, which may comply with the respective civil authorities in promoting the good and peace of church and state. 11. This pretended authority is needless and useless, not serving the ends which it proposes; they being better compassed without it: this shown.

V. The ancients asserted to each bishop a free, absolute, independent authority, subject to none, in the administration of affairs concerning his particular church.

This shown from the writings of St. Cyprian; from those of St. Austin: from a document addressed by the Roman clergy to Cyprian; by acts of the synods of Antioch and Chalcedon, &c.

VI. The ancients held all bishops, as to their office, originally according to divine institution, to be equal, as being all successors of the Apostles, &c. This dilated on. Quotations from Jerome, &c. First then, common practice, a good interpreter, shows that in the primitive church the Pope was not deemed to have a right of universal sovereignty: this explained. Secondly, the state of that church did not admit such an authority: this dilated on.

VII. The ancients, when occasion required, maintained their equality of office and authority; particularly in respect to the Roman bishop, both by practice, and express assertion in plain terms. Various instances of this enumerated.

VIII. The style used by the primitive bishops in their applications to him denotes such equality: this fully shown.

IX. This pretence is shaken by the very ground of that eminence which the Roman bishop did obtain in the church. This ground shown to be, not divine institution, &c. but the dignity, size, opulence, and conveniency of the city wherein he resided, &c. Other bishops, as those of Alexandria, Antioch,

Cæsarea, shown to have obtained a precedence on the same ground.

X. The truth is, all ecclesiastical presidences and subordinations, &c. were introduced merely by human ordinance, on prudential accounts, according to the exigency of circumstances. Hence the prerogatives of other sees proceeded; and hence any dignity, privilege, or authority which the Pope with equity might claim.

This point investigated; some observations propounded concerning the ancient forms of discipline; or the origin and growth of metropolitical, primatical, and patriarchal jurisdiction.

Twelve heads of observations on the interest of the Roman bishop, in reference to these circumstances: manner in which he assumed authority, and evaded obstacles, &c. described; also the resistance made to his encroachments.

Twenty heads of observations, or corollaries, drawn from the preceding historical account of the growth of metropolitical, primatical, and patriarchal jurisdiction; showing that patriarchs are a human institution, &c.; that the patriarchate of the Pope, beyond his own diocese, subsists not on any canon of a general synod, &c.; that it is not really a patriarchal power which the Pope exercises, &c.; and that the practice of Christianity does not depend on the subsistence of such a form instituted by man.

It having been shown that this universal sovereignty over the Christian church has no foundation in Scripture or elsewhere, it becomes requisite to show by what ways and means so groundless a claim should gain credence and submission to such an extent. Reasons of this: 1. in the voluntary deference paid to eminency of any kind, which thus passes into power, &c: 2. in the aptitude of power to grow and spread itself: 3. particularly in the case of spiritual power: 4. in the ease with which power is attained and augmented on occasion of dissensions: 5. as also through the cooperation of those who are sheltered under it and enjoy its privileges: 6. in the assistance which even an idle potentate possesses from partisans: 7. in the little scruple which persons, otherwise just and good, have to augment their power by encroachment, &c.:

8. in the commendations of men inferior in condition, which are liable to be interpreted for acknowlegements or attestations of right, &c.: 9. in the facility with which good and easy men are apt to yield to encroachments: 10. in the little power of counteraction, which a few wise men possess in such cases: 11. in the strange enchantment of words, working on the fancies of men, especially those of the weaker sort: 12. in the Pope's power being much amplified by persons who ran to it as to a place of refuge: 13. in the forwardness of all princes to heap honor on the bishop of their imperial city: 14. in the advantage which the Popes had of being at hand to suggest what they pleased to the court, &c.: 15. in the wealth, repute, and power at court, which they thus obtained over the provincial bishops: 16. in the want of foresight in princes who favored them: 17. in the favorable seasons and junctures for its growth, which power, once rooted, always finds: 18. in the ignorance of the times: 19. in the Pope's forwardness to support factious churchmen against princes: 20. in his engaging most able heads, tongues, and pens, in his favor, &c.: 21. in his cherishing so great a party with exorbitant liberties, &c.: 22. in his founding divers militias, or bands of spiritual Janizaries, to be combatants for his interests: 23. in the drawing to himself vast stores of riches, which are the sinews of power: method of doing this enumerated: 24. in his transforming, by help of his mercenary divines, most points of divinity to the accommodation of his interests: 25. in pretences, slender in themselves, which acquired validity by length of time, consent of authors, &c.: 26. in the histories of some ages, composed by friars and monks, and other such of his clients: 27. in his helping temporal and spiritual powers against each other for his own interest: 28. in his incessant clamor, when his will was opposed, that *St. Peter was injured:* 29. in the forgery of the Decretal Epistles, &c.: 30. in his forming grants wherein privileges were feigned to be derived from him: 31. in the opportune convention of subservient synods: 32. in his having hampered all the clergy with strict oaths of universal obedience to him: 33. in the compositions which he made with struggling and afflicted princes: instances given: 34. in the revocation of

pragmatical sanctions: 35. in the use of an absolving and dispensing power: 36. in the device of indulgencies.

SUPPOSITION VI.—*That in fact the Roman bishops, continually from St. Peter's time, have enjoyed and exercised this sovereign power.*

This is a question of fact, which will best be decided by a particular consideration of the several branches of sovereign power; by which we shall find that the Pope has no just title to them, in reason, law, or ancient practice: wherefore they yield arguments against him.

I. If the Pope were sovereign of the Church, he would have power to convoke its supreme councils, and would have constantly exercised it. This power consequently he claims, and did so, long before he could obtain the exercise of it.

It is shown, however, that he can claim it by no ecclesiastical law, canon, or practice.

It was always deemed the right of the emperors, and was constantly exercised by them: this shown by a multitude of examples, &c.

This power shown peculiarly to belong to princes: the same illustrated from Holy Writ. Other reasons stated why such a right should belong to them. An objection answered.

II. It inseparably belongs to sovereigns, in the general assemblies of their states, to preside, and to moderate affairs, &c.

This privilege therefore the Pope claims; not allowing any council to be legitimate in which he does not preside personally, or by his legates.

It is shown that for this prerogative there is no express grant from God, no ancient canon, no certain custom or practice.

In all the first synods, the emperors presided, in person, or by deputies.

This shown by numerous instances; and the presumptuous attempts of some Popes noticed.

Reasons given why it is unfit that this privilege should be attached to the Popedom.

III. If the Pope were sovereign of the Church, the legislative power, wholly or in part, would belong to him; so far indeed, that no synod could without his consent prescribe any thing; at least he should have a negative on their proceedings, &c. This therefore is claimed by him. Papal declarations given, signifying that no decrees of synods are valid without the Pope's confirmation.

Yet this pretence not only has no ground in the divine law, old canons, and primitive customs, but it crosses the sentiments and practice of antiquity.

It is shown by various instances that in ancient synods various things were ordained without the Pope's consent, and against his pleasure.

It is also shown that the effectual confirmation of synods, which gave them the force of laws, depended on the imperial sanction. Instances cited.

It is opposed that the decrees of some synods, as that of Ariminum, have been declared invalid, for want of the Pope's confirmation. Answers given to this exception.

IV. It is proper to an absolute sovereignty, that its will, declared in way of precept or proclamation, concerning the sanction, abrogation, or dispensation of laws, should be observed.

This privilege therefore in a high strain the Pope challenges to himself, asserting to his decrees, &c. the force and obligation of laws, &c.

Aphorisms cited from Gratian concerning this privilege.

This power is shown to be assumed on usurpation and unwarrantably, without ground for it in original right or ancient practice.

Originally the Church had no other general Lawgiver, beside our *one Lord* and *one Lawgiver*.

With regard to practice, many arguments are brought to show that no such practice anciently did or could exist.

V. Sovereign power, immediately by itself, when it pleases, exercises all parts of jurisdiction, setting itself in the tribunal; or mediately executes it by others, as its officers or commissioners.

This universal jurisdiction therefore over the clergy is claimed by the Pope.

This claim shown to rest originally or anciently on no good grounds; such jurisdiction being prohibited by our Saviour; when introduced into the Church, exercised by others as well as the Pope; his superior claim to it resisted by bishops and synods; and rendered subordinate to that of the emperors.

VI. To the sovereign of any state belongs the choice, constitution, and confirmation of all inferior magistrates.

Wherefore the Pope claims and exercises these prerogatives as far as he can; and they are by great advocates on the highest terms asserted to him.

In this matter may be distinguished, 1. the designation of the person by election, &c.: 2. the confirmation of this: 3. the ordination of him to his office: 4. the authority by which he acts. Into all of which the Pope has intruded himself. This shown.

But no such privileges have any foundation in holy Scripture, in ancient doctrine, or in primitive usage.

This shown by a survey of rules and practices concerning it, from the ordination of Mathias, to the times of the synods of Nice and Chalcedon. Extracts from the works of ancient Fathers.

To all such evidences of facts the Romanists oppose some instances of Popes constituting and confirming bishops.

To the former instances it may be answered, they are so few that they strengthen our argument. With regard to the latter, presumptuous pragmatical intrusions or usurpations of power do not found a right in this or in any other case; to which purpose, and wholly to invalidate any such pleas, various observations are subjoined; showing that divers instances occur of bishops who did meddle in the ordination of others, who did not thereby pretend to universal jurisdiction; that general synods undertook to regulate this matter; that if examples determined right, such right would more properly belong to the emperors; that general synods by paramount authority have assumed such to themselves, &c. &c.

VII. Sovereigns have a power to censure and correct all inferior magistrates, and, if need be, to discharge them.

This prerogative therefore is claimed, as from divine sanction, by the Pope.

This power was allowed him by the Convocation of Trent, thwarting the ancient laws, and betraying the liberties of the Church thereby, &c.

But such a power did not anciently, by any rule or custom, in a peculiar manner belong to the Roman bishop.

What was generally said about jurisdiction being premised, it is here remarked, 1. that the exercising of judgment and censure on bishops, when needful, was prescribed to be done by synods, provincial or patriarchal : instances alleged. 2. In some cases a kind of deposing of bishops was assumed by bishops, as defenders of the faith, and executors of canons : instances quoted. 3. Cyprian asserts the power of censuring bishops, on needful and just occasion, to belong to all bishops, for maintenance of common faith, discipline, and peace : 4. this also is confirmed in some cases by the nature of such censures : 5. indeed in such cases every Christian had a right, or even obligation, to desert his own bishop. 6. If any Pope assumed more than was allowed in this case by the canons, or was common to other bishops of his rank, it was an usurpation : 7. when the Pope hath attempted this, his power has been disavowed. 8. Other bishops have taken on themselves, when they saw cause, to discard and depose Popes. 9. Popes, when there was great occasion, and they had a great mind to exert their utmost power, have not yet presumed by themselves, *without joint authority of synods*, to condemn bishops : 10. what has been thus done, is not to be ascribed to the authority of Popes as such. 11. If instances were arguments of right, there would be other pretenders to the deposing power : 12. the people, for instance, would have it; for they have sometimes deposed Popes. 13. There are many instances of bishops being removed or deposed by the imperial authority : instances given. 14. The instances alleged to prove the Pope's authority in this case are inconclusive and invalid : this shown in a variety of cases.

VIII. If Popes were sovereigns of the Church, they could

effectually, whenever they should see it just and fit, absolve and restore any bishop excommunicated from the Church, or deposed by ecclesiastical censure.

Wherefore the Pope assumes this power, as his special prerogatives: quotations on this point.

It is shown however that such a power of old did not belong to him: 1. from no traces existing of it in any ancient canon: 2. from decrees of synods: 3. from the apostolical canons: 4. from the circumstance that hence in elder times Popes were opposed and checked when they offered to receive bishops rejected in particular synods.

But they allege some instances of such a power.

These therefore are answered, first, by some general consideration, relating chiefly to the import of *restitution;* and next by replies to the particular instances produced for the Pope.

IX. It belongs to sovereigns to receive appeals from all lower judicatures, for the final determination of causes, &c.

This power therefore the Pope stiffly asserts to himself; and this at the synod of Florence was the first and great branch of authority which he demanded of the Greeks explicitly to avow: this was one of his most ancient encroachments, which served to introduce the rest.

But this power is unreasonable and grievous to the Church: so deemed by ancient synods and Fathers: instances given.

In the primitive church the Pope had no such power. This fully shown both by negative and positive testimonies.

If the Pope had such a known and unquestionable right, there might have been produced many ancient, clear, and convincing proofs of it.

Some alleged by Bellarmine. These examined and refuted; particularly those of Theodoret and Hadrianus, bishop of Thebes.

Some general observations proposed, (in regard to any other instances of this kind,) in the motives and conduct of bad and even good men, when induced to make appeals to superiors.

X. The Sovereign is the fountain of all jurisdiction; and all inferior magistrates derive their authority from him, &c.

Accordingly the Pope challenges this advantage, &c.: in-

stances from various documents. This pretence appears in the ordinary titles of bishops: also in the Council of Trent.

But on the contrary, according to Holy Scripture, and to the sense of the primitive church, bishops and pastors receive their commission immediately from God; being only his ministers. This fully shown from Scripture; from the writings of the Fathers; from addresses of ancient bishops to the Pope.

This a modern invention: shown to have arisen in the fourth century, by the appointment of vicars and legates.

XI. It is the privilege of a sovereigh, that he cannot be called to account, judged, deposed, &c. To this privilege also the Pope pretends, from maxims of the Canon Law; from that of Pope Adrian; and from the three old synods, which are palpably spurious.

Antiquity however was not of this mind. It is shown that the canons and ancient practice are opposed to this pretence.

XII. To the sovereign in ecclesiastical affairs it would belong to define and decide all controversies in faith, discipline, and moral practice, &c. This power therefore he claims, and allows no synods to decide questions.

But the ancients knew no such thing. They had recourse to the Scriptures, to Catholic tradition, to reason and argument.

Instances of holy Fathers passing over such authority, or openly dissenting from the opinions of Popes.

Highest controversies were appeased by synods, sometimes without the Pope's leave, and against his opinion: instances quoted.

XIII. If the Pope were such a sovereign, it were at least expedient that he should be infallible. Wherefore the true and fast friends of papal interest assert this; and the Pope, who countenances them, may be presumed to be of their mind.

That he is however not infallible, is shown by experience and history.

XIV. A sovereign is in dignity and authority superior to any number of subjects however congregated. Therefore the Pope claims a superiority over all councils, pretending that he can rescind their decrees, or dissolve them, &c.

This is indeed a question stiffly debated among Romanists,

but most adhere to the Pope's side: reason of this given. But anciently he was not thought superior to councils: this shown. Even in the very height of his power this authority was at times questioned and decided against him: instances given.

XV. The sovereign of the Church is by all Christians to be acknowleged the chief person in the world, above all commands, &c.

This pretended to: this claimed in their Missal.

But this was not so in primitive times; for St. Paul requires *every soul to be subject to the higher powers,* when the emperor was avowedly the first person next to God. Divers Popes avowed themselves subject to the emperor.

XVI. The confirmation of magistrates, elected by others, is a branch of supremacy affected by the Pope: instances quoted. This pretence shown to have arisen from the ancient custom of newly-elected bishops giving notice of their election to other bishops, especially those of highest rank: reasons for this custom. Anciently the emperors confirmed bishops.

XVII. It is a privilege of sovereigns to grant privileges, exemptions, and dispensations. This also he claims against the laws of God; the rights of bishops; the decrees of synods; and the sense of good men in all times.

XVIII. It is a prerogative of sovereignty to erect and translate spiritual presidences. This he claims, without reason. Princes often exerted such a privilege; this attested by Pope Paschal II.

XIX. It is against prerogative of sovereignty to impose taxes on the clergy or people; wherefore the Pope assumes this. But antiquity knew nothing of such impositions; when the church, the clergy, and the poor were maintained and relieved by voluntary offerings, &c. This is an encroachment on the right of princes, unto whom the clergy are subjects, *being bound to render tribute to whom tribute belongeth.*

SUPPOSITION VII.—*That the Papal Supremacy is indefectible and unalterable.*

But good reasons may be assigned, why, even supposing this

supremacy conferred on the Pope in virtue of his succession to St. Peter, it is not assuredly consequent that it must always or does now belong to him. For it might have been settled on him on conditions, &c., or so that it should continue but for a time. There are also other ways, whereby, according to the common rules of justice he might be disseized thereof.

1. If God had given any positive declaration that such a power was granted irrevocably, then it must have been admitted: but this he has not done; and no human power can be supposed immovable, &c. 2. No power can have a higher source or firmer ground than that of the civil government, for *all such power is from heaven:* yet such power is liable to alterations, and may be lost, &c. 3. The reason and exigency of things might be sufficient ground for altering an universal jurisdiction. 4. It is according to reason and practice that the church, in its exterior form and political administrations, should be suited to the state of the world, and political governments, &c.: wherefore St. Peter's monarchy might be parcelled out into divers spiritual supremaces: 5. especially if such a continued jurisdiction should prove corrupt and grievous to the Church. 6. That power is defectible which according to the course of things does sometimes fail; but the Papal succession has often been interrupted. 7. If, leaving dubious suppositions, we consider that Papal preeminence was obtained by the wealth and dignity of the Roman city, and countenance of the imperial authority, then by defect of such advantages it may cease, &c. 8. From whatever source the Pope had his authority, yet it may be forfeited by his own defects and faults. 9. By departing from the doctrine and practice of St. Peter he would forfeit it. 10. By leading men into pernicious error or impiety. 11. According to Romanists the Pope has the same relation to other bishops and pastors, as they bear to their people: but if any pastor should mislead his flock by bad doctrine or practice, they may reject him. 12. The case may be that we may be obliged to hold no communion with the Pope; and then his authority ceases. 13. This shown to be the doctrine of Scripture with respect to pastors and teachers. 14. With this the Fathers accord: instances quoted. 15. This shown also to have been the current opinion: instances given.

16. This shown to apply to the Pope. 17. Most eminent persons have in such cases withdrawn communion from the Pope. 18. The Canon law itself admits that the Pope may be judged, if he be a heretic. 19. This fact was acknowleged by a great Pope, allowing the condemnation of Pope Honorius.

It is lastly shown that the Pope (or Papal succession) hath perverted the Christian doctrine in contradiction to Scripture and primitive tradition; hath subverted the practice of Christian piety; hath taught falsehoods and maintained impieties. This shown, in the encouragement of extravagant doctrines and practices of high-flying doctors and fierce zealots, &c.; in the teaching us to worship angels and dead men; in the canonising of saints, and anticipating of God's judgment, &c.; in the worship of images; in absolution and the dispensations of pardon for sin; in arrogating superiority over all civil powers, &c.; in obtruding on the Church writings, as sacred and canonical, which the greatest part of learned men have refused as such; in pretending to infallibility; in ordering oral traditions of the Roman church to be venerated like the holy Scripture, &c.; in keeping the Scriptures from the people, locked up in languages not understood by them; in celebrating the Liturgy in an unknown tongue; in assuming to himself the headship of the Christian Church, contrary to Scripture; in forbidding marriage to the priests; in dissolving the matrimonial tie; in prohibiting the cup to the laity at the holy communion; in the doctrine of transubstantiation; in the *propitiatory* sacrifice of the mass; in the doctrine of justification; in arrogating the name and privilege of the only church; in the institution of seven sacraments, instead of the two appointed by our Saviour; in exacting submission to the *various and strange doctrines* of the Roman Church; particularly in exacting consent and obedience to those of the Council of Trent; in persecuting those who do not obey the doctrines and dictates of the Roman Church; in altering the whole of theology from head to foot, and rendering it sophistical instead of divine: instances quoted.

A TREATISE OF THE

POPE'S SUPREMACY.

INTRODUCTION.

§. 1. THE Roman party doth much glory in unity and certainty of doctrine, as things peculiar to them, and which no other men have any means to attain: yet about divers matters of notable consideration, in what they agree, or of what they are certain, it is hard to descry.

They pretend it very needful that controversies should be decided, and that they have a special knack of doing it: yet do many controversies of great weight and consequence stick on their hands unresolved, many points rest in great doubt and debate among them.

The κύριαι δόξαι of the Roman sect (concerning doctrine, practice, laws and customs of discipline, rites and ceremonies) are of divers sorts, or built on divers grounds. 1. Some established by (pretended) general synods. 2. Some founded on decrees of Popes. 3. Some entertained as on tradition, custom, common agreement. 4. Some which their eminent divines or schoolmen do commonly embrace. 5. Some prevailing by the favor of the Roman court, and its zealous dependents.

Hence it is very difficult to know wherein their religion consisteth: for those grounds divers times seem to clash, and accordingly their divines (some building on these, some on others) disagree.

This being so in many points of importance, is so particularly in this.

For instance, the head of their Church (as they call it) is, one would think, a subject about which they should thoroughly consent, and which they, by this time, should have cleared from all disputes; so that (so far as their decisive faculty goeth) we might be assured wherein his authority consisteth,

and how far it doth extend; seeing the resolution of that point so nearly toucheth the heart of religion, the faith and practice of all Christians, the good of the church, and peace of the world; seeing that no one question (perhaps not all questions together) hath created so many tragical disturbances in Christendom, as that concerning the bounds of papal authority.

This disagreement of the Roman doctors about the nature and extent of papal authority is a shrewd prejudice against it. If a man should sue for a piece of land, and his advocates (the notablest could be had, and well paid) could not find where it lieth, how it is butted and bounded, from whom it was conveyed to him, one would be very apt to suspect his title. If God had instituted such an office, it is highly probable we might satisfactorily know what the nature and use of it were: the patents and charters for it would declare it.

Yet for resolution in this great case we are left to seek; they not having either the will, or the courage, or the power, to determine it. This insuperable problem hath baffled all their infallible methods of deciding controversies; their traditions blundering, their synods clashing, their divines wrangling endlessly about what kind of thing the Pope is, and what power he rightly may claim.

"There is" (saith a great divine among them) "so much controversy about the plenitude of ecclesiastical power, and to what things it may extend itself, that few things in that matter are secure——."*

This is a plain argument of the impotency of the Pope's power in judging and deciding controversies, or of his cause in this matter; that he cannot define a point so nearly concerning him, and which he so much desireth an agreement in; that he cannot settle his own claim out of doubt; that all his authority cannot secure itself from contest.

So indeed it is, that no spells can allay some spirits; and where interests are irreconcilable, opinions will be so.

Some points are so tough and so touchy, that nobody dare meddle with them, fearing that their resolution will fail of success and submission. Hence even the anathematising definers of Trent (the boldest undertakers to decide controversies that ever were) did wave this point; the legates of the Pope being enjoined, "to advertise, That they should not for any cause whatever come to dispute about the Pope's authority."†

It was indeed wisely done of them to decline this question, their authority not being strong enough to bear the weight of a

* Almain. de Auct. Eccl. cap. 3. † Concil. Trid. lib. ii. p. 59.

decision in favor of the Roman see, (against which they could do nothing,) according to its pretences; as appeareth by one clear instance. For whereas that council took on it incidentally to enact that any prince should be excommunicate, and deprived of the dominion of any city or place, where he should permit a duel to be fought; the prelates of France in the Convention of Orders, anno 1595, did declare against that decree, as infringing their king's authority.

It was therefore advisedly done not to meddle with so ticklish a point. But in the meantime their policy seemeth greater than their charity; which might have inclined them not to leave the world in darkness and doubt, and unresolved in a point of so main importance; (as indeed they did in others of no small consequence, disputed among their divines with obstinate heat, viz. the divine right of bishops, the necessity of residence, the immaculate conception, &c.)

The opinions therefore among them concerning the Pope's authority, as they have been, so they are, and in likelihood may continue, very different.

§. II. There are among them those who ascribe to the Pope an universal, absolute, and boundless empire over all persons indifferently, and in all matters; conferred and settled on him by divine immutable sanction: so that all men, of whatever degree, are obliged in conscience to believe whatever he doth authoritatively dictate, and to obey whatever he doth prescribe. So that if princes themselves do refuse obedience to his will, he may excommunicate them, cashier them, depose them, extirpate them. If he chargeth us to hold no communion with our prince, to renounce our allegiance to him, to abandon, oppose, and persecute him, even to death, we may without scruple, we must in duty obey. If he doth interdict whole nations from the exercise of God's worship and service, they must comply therein. So that, according to their conceits, he is in effect sovereign lord of all the world; and superior, even in temporal or civil matters, unto all kings and princes.

It is notorious that many canonists (if not most) and many divines of that party do maintain this doctrine; affirming that all the power of Christ (the Lord of lords, and King of kings, to whom all power in heaven and earth doth appertain) is imparted to the Pope, as to his vicegerent.

This is the doctrine which almost four hundred years ago Augustinus Triumphus, in his egregious work concerning ecclesiastical power, did teach;* attributing to the Pope "an in-

* Aug. Triumph. de Potest. Eccl. in præf. ad P. Joh. XXII.

comprehensible and infinite power; because great is the Lord, and great is his power, and of his greatness there is no end."

This is the doctrine which the leading theologue of their sect, their angelical doctor, doth affirm, both directly, saying, that "in the Pope is the top of both powers;"* and by plain consequence, asserting, that "when any one is denounced excommunicate for apostasy, his subjects are immediately freed from his dominion, and their oath of allegiance to him."

This the same Thomas (or an author passing under his name, in his book touching the Rule of Princes) doth teach, affirming that the Pope, "as Supreme King of all the world, may impose taxes on all Christians, and destroy towns and castles for the preservation of Christianity."†

This (as Cardinal Zabarell near three hundred years ago telleth us) is the doctrine "which, for a long time, those who would please Popes did persuade them, that they could do all things, whatever they pleased; yea, and things unlawful; and so could do more than God."‡

According to this doctrine then current at Rome, in the last Lateran great synod, under the Pope's nose and in his ear, one bishop styled him, Prince of the World;§ another orator called him, King of Kings, and Monarch of the Earth;‖ another great prelate said of him, that "he had all power above all powers both of heaven and earth."¶ And the same roused up Pope Leo X. in these brave terms; "Snatch up therefore the two-edged sword of divine power, committed to thee; and enjoin, command, and charge, that an universal peace and alliance be made among Christians for at least ten years; and to that bind kings in the fetters of the Great King, and constrain nobles by the iron manacles of censures: for to thee is given all power in heaven and in earth."**

This is the doctrine which Baronius, with a Roman confidence, doth so often assert and drive forward, saying, that "there can be no doubt of it, but that the civil principality is subject to the sacerdotal:"†† and, that "God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual Church."‡‡

§. III. From that doctrine the opinion in effect doth not differ, which Bellarmine voucheth for the common opinion of Catholics, that "by reason of the spiritual power, the Pope, at

* Th. ii. Secund. qu. 12. art. 2. † Bell. v. 5.
‡ Zab. de Schism. § Episc. Spal. Sess. i. p. 24.
‖ Del Rio, Sess. viii. p. 87. ¶ Episc. Patrac. Sess. x. p. 132.
** Ibid. p. 133. †† Ann. 57. §. 23. ‡‡ Ibid. §. 53.

least indirectly, hath a supreme power even in temporal matters."*

This opinion, so common, doth not, I say, in effect and practical consideration, anywise differ from the former; but only in words devised to shun envy, and veil the impudence of the other assertion: for the qualifications, 'by reason of the spiritual power,' and, 'at least indirectly,' are but notional, insignificant, and illusive, in regard to practice: it importing not, if he hath in his keeping a sovereign power, on what account, or in what formality he doth employ it; seeing that every matter is easily referrible to a spiritual account; seeing he is sole judge on what account he doth act; seeing experience showeth that he will spiritualise all his interests, and on any occasion exercise that pretended authority; seeing it little mattereth, if he may strike princes, whether he doth it by a downright blow, or slantingly.

§. IV. That such an universal and absolute power hath been claimed by divers popes, successively for many ages, is apparent from their most solemn declarations and notorious practices; whereof (beginning from later times, and rising upwards toward the source of this doctrine) we shall represent some.

The bull of Pope Sixtus V. [An. 1585.] against the two sons of wrath, Henry, King of Navarre, and the Prince of Condé, beginneth thus: "The authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the Eternal King, excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes—It passes uncontrollable sentence on them all—And if it find any of them resisting God's ordinance, it takes more severe vengeance of them, casting them down from their thrones, though never so puissant, and tumbling them down to the lowest parts of the earth, as the ministers of aspiring Lucifer." And then he proceeds to thunder against them, "We deprive them and their posterity for ever of their dominions and kingdoms;" and accordingly he depriveth those princes of their kingdoms and dominions, absolveth their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and forbiddeth them to pay any obedience to them. "By the authority of these presents, we do absolve and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, and from all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fealty, and obedience; and do charge and forbid all and every of them, that they do not dare to obey them, or any of their admonitions, laws, and commands."†

Pope Pius V. [An. 1570.] (one of the holiest Popes of the

* Bell. v. 1. † Bulla Sixti V. contra Henr. Navarr. R. &c.

last stamp, who hardly hath escaped canonisation until now*) beginneth his bull against our Queen Elizabeth in these words: "He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, hath committed the one holy Catholic and apostolic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone on earth, namely, to Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and to the Roman Pontiff, successor of Peter, to be governed with a plenitude of power: this one he hath constituted prince over all nations, and all kingdoms, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruinate, plant, and build."†—And in the same bull he declares that "he thereby deprives the queen of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and absolves all the nobles, subjects, and people of the kingdom, and whoever else have sworn to her, from their oath, and all duty whatsoever, in regard of dominion, fidelity, and obedience."

Pope Clement VI. [An. 1346.] did pretend to depose the Emperor Lewis IV.

Pope Clement V. [An. 1311.] in the great synod of Vienna, declared the emperor subject to him, or standing obliged to him by a proper oath of fealty.

Pope Boniface VIII. [An. 1294.] hath a decree extant in the canon law running thus: "We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." The which subjection, according to his intent, reacheth all matters; for he there challengeth a double sword, and asserteth to himself jurisdiction over all temporal authorities: for, "One sword," saith he, "must be under another, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power;—whence, if the earthly power doth go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual power." The which aphorisms he proveth by Scriptures admirably expounded to that purpose.

This definition might pass for a rant of that boisterous Pope, ("a man above measure ambitious and arrogant,") vented in his passion against King Philip of France, if it had not the advantage (of a greater than which no papal decree is capable) of being expressly confirmed by one of their general councils; for, "We" (saith Pope Leo X. in his bull read and passed in the Lateran Council) "do renew and approve that holy constitution, with approbation of the present holy council." Accordingly Melch. Canus, saith that "the Lateran Council did re-

* Briet. Chr. anno 1572.

† P. Pius V. in Bull. contra R. Eliz. (Camb. Hist. anno 1570.)

new and approve that extravagant (indeed extravagant) constitution :"* and Baronius saith of it, that "all do assent to it, so that none dissenteth, who doth not by discord fall from the Church."†

The truth is, Pope Boniface did not invent that proposition, but borrowed it from the school; for Thomas Aquinas, in his work against the Greeks, pretendeth to show that "it is of necessity to salvation to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."‡ The which scholastical aphorism Pope Boniface turned into law, and applied to his purpose of exercising domination over princes; offering, in virtue of it, to deprive King Philip of his kingdom.

The appendix to Mart. Pol. saith of Pope Boniface VIII. *Regem se Regum, Mundi Monarcham, unicum in spiritualibus et temporalibus Dominum promulgavit;* that "he openly declared himself to be King of Kings, Monarch of the World, and sole Lord and Governor both in spirituals and temporals."

Before him, Pope Innocent IV. [An. 1245.] did hold and exemplify the same notion; declaring the emperor Frederick II. his vassal, and denouncing, in his general council of Lyons, a sentence of deprivation against him in these terms: "We having about the foregoing and many other his wicked miscarriages had before a careful deliberation with our brethren and the holy council, seeing that we, although unworthy, do hold the place of Jesus Christ on earth, and that it was said unto us in the person of St. Peter the Apostle, Whatever thou shalt bind on earth—the said prince (who hath rendered himself unworthy of empire and kingdoms, and of all honor and dignity, and who for his iniquities is cast away by God, that he should not reign or command, being bound by his sins and cast away, and deprived by the Lord of all honor and dignity) do show, denounce, and accordingly, by sentence, deprive; absolving all who are held bound by oath of allegiance from such oath for ever; by apostolical authority firmly prohibiting, that no man henceforth do obey or regard him as emperor or king; and decreeing, that whoever shall hereafter yield advice, or aid, or favor to him as emperor or king, shall immediately lie under the band of excommunication."§

Before him, Pope Innocent the Third, (that "true wonder of the world, and changer of the age,"‖) did affirm, "the pontifical authority so much to exceed the royal power, as the sun

* Canus loc. vi. 4. † Baron. ann. 1053. §. 14.
‡ (Thom. in Opusc. contra Græcos.)
§ P. Innoc. IV. in Conc. Lugd. ‖ Matt. Par. anno 1217.

doth the moon;"* and applieth to the former that of the Prophet Jeremiah; *Ecce, constitui te super gentes et regna;*— "See, I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down," &c.

Of this power that Pope made experiment, by deposing the emperor Otho IV; "whom," saith Nauclerus, "as rebellious to the apostolical see, he first did strike with an anathema; then him persevering in his obstinacy did in a council of prelates, held at Rome, pronounce deposed from empire."†

The which authority was avowed by that great council under this Pope,‡ (the which, according to the men of Trent, did represent or constitute the Church,) wherein it was ordained, that if a "temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, should neglect to purge his territory from heretical filth, he should by the metropolitan and the other comprovincial bishops be noosed in the band of excommunication; and that if he should slight to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the Pope, that he might from that time denounce the subjects absolved from their fealty to him, and expose the territory to be seized on by Catholics," &c.

Before that, Pope Paschal II. [An. 1099.] deprived Henry IV. and excited enemies to persecute him; telling them that they could not "offer a more acceptable sacrifice to God, than by impugning him, who endeavored to take the kingdom from God's Church."§

Before him, Pope Urban II. [An. 1088.] (called Turban by some in his age) did preach this doctrine, recommended to us in the decrees, that "subjects are by no authority constrained to pay the fidelity which they have sworn to a Christian prince, who opposeth God and his saints, or violateth their precepts."‖ An instance whereof we have in his granting a privilege to the Canons of Tours; "which," saith he, "if any emperor, king, prince, &c. shall wilfully attempt to thwart, let him be deprived of the dignity of his honor and power."¶

But the great apostle (if not author) of this confounding doctrine was Pope Gregory VII. (a man of a bold spirit and fiery temper, inured even before his entry on that see to bear sway, and drive on daring projects; possessed with resolution to use

* P. Innoc. III. in Decret. Greg. lib. i. tit. 33. cap. 6.

† Naucl. anno 1212.

‡ Syn. Trid. Sess. xiv. cap. 5. Conc. Later. cap. 3. in Decret. Greg. lib. v. tit. 7. cap. 13.

§ P. Pasch. Ep. vii. ad Rob. Fland. Com.

‖ Caus. xv. qu. 7. cap. 5. ¶ P. Urb. II. Ep. 12.

the advantages of his place and time in pushing forward the papal interest to the utmost,) who did lift up his voice like a trumpet, kindling wars and seditions thereby over Christendom. His dictates and practices are well known, being iterated in his own epistles, and in the Roman councils under him, extant:* yet it may be worth the while to hear him swagger in his own language.

"For the dignity and defence of God's holy Church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from imperial and royal administration, King Henry, son of Henry sometime emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy Church; and I absolve all Christians subject to the empire from that oath whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true kings: for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity, who doth endeavor to diminish the majesty of the Church."†

"Go to therefore, most holy princes of the Apostles, and what I said, by interposing your authority, confirm; that all men may now at length understand, if ye can bind and loose in heaven, that ye also can on earth take away and give empires, kingdoms, and whatsoever mortals can have: for if ye can judge things belonging unto God, what is to be deemed concerning these inferior and profane things? And if it is your part to judge angels, who govern proud princes, what becometh it you to do toward their servants? Let kings now, and all secular princes, learn by this man's example, what ye can do in heaven, and in what esteem ye are with God; and let them henceforth fear to slight the commands of holy Church: but put forth suddenly this judgment, that all men may understand, that not casually, but by your means, this son of iniquity doth fall from his kingdom."‡

So did that Pope, not unadvisedly in heat or passion, but out of settled judgment, on cool deliberation, express himself in his synods at Rome.

This Pope is indeed by many held the inventor and broacher of this strange doctrine; and even those, who about his age did oppose it, did express themselves of this mind; calling it the novel tradition, schism, heresy of Hildebrand.§

"Pope Hildebrand" (saith the Church of Liege, in their

* Vide ejus dictata apud Bin. post. Ep. lib. 2. Ep. lv. Ep. iv. 2. viii 21. et passim. Ep. i. 58. ii. 5. 12. 13. 18. 32. iii. 10. iv. 1. 2. 3. 7. 22

† Plat. in Greg. VII. et tom. 7. Conc. Rom. iii. apud Bin. p. 484.

‡ Plat. in Greg. VII. Conc. Rom. vii. apud Bin. tom. vii. p. 491.

§ Eccl. Leod. apud Bin. tom. vii. p. 521.

answer to the Epistle to Pope Paschal) "is author of this new schism, and first did raise the priest's lance against the royal diadem.—Who first did girt himself, and by his example other popes, with the sword of war against the emperors."*

"This only novelty," saith Sigebert, "not to say heresy, had not yet sprang up in the world, that the priests of him who saith to the king, Apostate, and who maketh hypocrites to reign for the sins of the people, should teach the people that they owe no subjection to bad kings; and although they have sworn allegiance to the king, they yet owe him none, and that they who take part against the king may not be said to be perjured; yea, that he who shall obey the king may be held excommunicate; he that shall oppose the king, may be absolved from the crime of injustice and perjury."†

Indeed certain it is that this man did in most downright strains hold the doctrine, and most smartly apply it to practice; yet did he disclaim the invention or introduction of it; professing that he followed the notions and examples of his predecessors, divers of which he allegeth in defence of his proceedings. "We," saith he, "holding the statutes of our holy predecessors, do by apostolical authority absolve those from their oath who are obliged by fealty or sacrament to excommunicate persons, and by all means prohibit that they observe fealty to them."‡

And so it is, that (although for many successions before Pope Hildebrand the Popes were not in condition or capacity to take so much on them; there having been a row of persons intruded into that see, void of virtue, and of small authority, most of them very beasts, who depended on the favor of princes for their admittance, confirmation, or support in the place; yet) we may find some Popes before him, who had a great spice of those imperious conceits, and on occasion made very bold with princes, assuming power over them, and darting menaces against them. For,

Pope Leo IX. telleth us that Constantine M. "did think it very unbecoming that they should be subject to an earthly empire whom the Divine Majesty had set over an heavenly:"§ and surely he was of his author's mind, whom he alleged; although indeed this Pope may be supposed to speak this, and other sayings to that purpose, by suggestion of Hildebrand, by whom he was much governed.

* Eccl. Leod. apud Bin. tom. vii. p. 522. 523.
† Sigeb. Chron. anno 1088.
‡ Greg. VII. Ep. viii. 21. Caus. xv. qu. 7. cap. 4.
§ P. Leo IX. Ep. i. cap. 12.

Pope Stephanus VI. told the emperor Basilius, that "he ought to be subject with all veneration to the Roman Church."*

Pope John VIII. (or IX.) [An. 873.] did pretend obedience due to him from princes; and in default thereof threatened to excommunicate them.†

Pope Nicolas I. [An. 858.] cast many imperious sayings and threats at king Lotharius: these among others. "We do therefore by apostolical authority, under obtestation of the divine judgment, enjoin to thee, that in Triers and Colen thou shouldest not suffer any bishop to be chosen, before a report be made to our apostleship."‡ (Was not this *satis pro imperio?*) And again, "That being compelled thou mayest be able to repent, know, that very soon thou shalt be struck with the ecclesiastical sword; so that thou mayest be afraid any more to commit such things in God's holy Church."§

And this he suggesteth for right doctrine, that subjection is not due to bad princes; perverting the Apostle's words to that purpose; "Be subject to the king as excelling, that is," saith he, "in virtues, not in vices:"‖ whereas the Apostle meaneth eminency in power.

Pope Gregory VII. doth also allege Pope Zachary, "who," saith he, "did depose the king of the Franks, and did absolve all the French from the oath of fidelity which they had taken unto him, not so much for his iniquities, as because he was unfit for such a power."¶

This indeed was a notable act of jurisdiction, if Pope Gregory's word may be taken for matter of fact; but divers maintain that Pope Zachary did only concur with the rebellious deposers of king Chilperick in way of advice or approbation, not by authority.

It was pretty briskly said of Pope Adrian I. [An. 772.] "We do by general decree constitute that whatever king, or bishop, or potentate, shall hereafter believe, or permit, that the censure of the Roman pontiffs may be violated in any case, he shall be an execrable anathema, and shall be guilty before God, as a betrayer of the Catholic faith."**

"Constitutions against the canons and decrees of the bishops of Rome, or against good manners, are of no moment."††

Before that, Pope Gregory II. [An. 730.] because the

* Steph. VI. Ep. i. Baron. ann. 885. §. 11.
† Joh. VIII. Ep. 119. ‡ Grat. Dist. lxiii. cap. 4.
§ P. Nic. I. Ep. 64. ‖ P. Nic. I. Epist. 4. Append. p. 626.
¶ Decret. ii. part. Caus. xv. q. 6.
** P. Had. I. Capit. apud Grat. Caus. xxv. qu. 1. cap. 11.
†† Distinct. x. cap. 4.

eastern emperor did cross the worship of images, did withdraw subjection from him, and did thrust his authority out of Italy. "He," saith Baronius, "did effectually cause both the Romans and Italians to recede from obedience to the emperor."*

This was an act in truth of rebellion against the emperor, in pretence of jurisdiction over him; for how otherwise could he justify or color the fact? "So," as Baronius reflecteth, "he did leave to posterity a worthy example, (forsooth,) that heretical princes should not be suffered to reign in the Church of Christ, if, being warned, they were found pertinacious in error."†

And no wonder he then was so bold, seeing the Pope had obtained so much respect in those parts of the world, that (as he told the emperor Leo Isaurus) "all the kingdoms of the west did hold St. Peter as an earthly god:"‡ of which he might be able to seduce some to uphold him in his rebellious practices.

This is the highest source, as I take it, to which this extravagant doctrine can be driven. For that single passage of Pope Felix III., though much ancienter, will not amount to it. "It is certain that, in causes relating to God, it is the safest course for you, that, according to his institution, ye endeavor to submit the will of the king to the priests," &c.§

For while the emperor did retain any considerable authority in Italy, the popes were better advised than to vent such notions; and while they themselves did retain any measure of pious or prudent modesty, they were not disposed to it. And we may observe divers popes near that time in word and practice thwarting that practice. For instance,

Pope Gelasius, a vehement stickler for papal authority, doth say to the emperor Anastasius, "I, as being a Roman born, do love, worship, reverence thee as the Roman prince."‖ And he saith that "the prelates of religion (knowing the empire conferred on him by Divine Providence) did obey his laws."¶ And otherwhere he discourseth, that "Christ had distinguished by their proper acts and dignities the offices of ecclesiastical and civil power," that one should not meddle with the other; so disclaiming temporal power due to himself, being content to screw up his spiritual authority.

After him, as is well known, Pope Gregory I. (as became a pious and good man) did avow the emperor for "his lord, by

* Baron. anno 730. §. 4. † Baron. ibid.
‡ Greg. II. Epist. i. Bin tom. v. p. 508.
§ P. Felix III. (anno 483.) Dist. x. cap. 3.
‖ P. Gelas. I. Epist. 8. (ad Anast. Imp.) ¶ Ibid.

God's gift superior to all men, to whom he was subject, whom he in duty was bound to obey;"* and supposed it a high presumption for any one to "set himself above the honor of the empire,"† by assuming the title of universal bishop.

After him, Pope Agatho, [An. 680.] in the acts of the Sixth General Council, doth call the emperor Constantine Pogonatus "his lord;" doth avow "himself, together with all presidents of the churches, servants to the emperor;"‡ doth say, that his see and his synod were subject to him, and did owe obedience to him.

Presently after him, Pope Leo II. who confirmed that general synod, doth call the emperor "the prototype son of the church;"§ and acknowlegeth the body of priests to be servants (meanest servants) "of his royal nobleness."‖

After him, Pope Constantine, [An. 709.] (the immediate predecessor of Pope Gregory II.) when the emperor did command him to come to Constantinople, "the most holy man," saith Anastasius in his Life, "did obey the imperial commands."¶

Yea, Pope Gregory II. himself, before his defection, (when perhaps the circumstances of time did not animate him thereto,) did, in his epistle to Leo Isaurus, acknowlege him as emperor to be "the head of Christians,"** and himself consequently subject to him.

This Gregory therefore may be reputed the father of that doctrine, which, being fostered by his successors, was by Pope Gregory VII. brought up to its robust pitch and stature.

I know, Pope Gregory VII. to countenance him, doth allege Pope Innocent I. excommunicating the emperor Arcadius for his proceedings against St. Chrysostom:†† and the writers of St. Chrysostom's Life, with others of the like age and credit, do back him therein. But seeing the historians who lived in St. Chrysostom's own time, and who write very carefully about him, do not mention any such thing; seeing that, being the first act in the kind, must have been very notable, and have made a great noise; seeing that story doth not suit with the tenor of proceedings, reported by those most credible historians, in that case; seeing that fact doth nowise sort to the condition and way of those times; that report cannot be true, and

* P. Greg. I. Ep. ii. 26. † Ep. iv. 32.
‡ Act. Syn. vi. pp. 53. 304. 32. 94. 64. 33. 34.
§ Act. Syn. VI. p. 303. ‖ Ibid. p. 304.
¶ Anast. in Vit. P. Const.
** P. Greg. II. ad Leon. Is. Ep. i. (p. 502.)
†† Greg. VII. Ep. viii. 2. Baron. an. 407. §. 23.

it must be numbered among the many fabulous narrations, devised by some wanton Greeks, to set out the life of that excellent personage.

The same Pope doth also allege St. Gregory M. denouncing excommunication and "deprivation of honor, to all kings, bishops, judges," &c. who should violate the privilege granted to the monastery of St. Medard.* But this (as are many such privileges) is a rank forgery, unworthily imposed on Pope Gregory, (that prudent, meek, and holy man,) much to his wrong and disgrace: which I will not be at trouble to confute, having showed St. Gregory to have been of another judgment and temper, than to behave himself thus towards princes; and seeing that task is abundantly discharged by that very learned man, Monsieur Launoy. †

Indeed, (on this occasion to digress a little farther,) it doth not seem to have been the opinion of the ancient popes, that they might excommunicate their sovereign princes: for if they might, why did they forbear to exercise that power, when there was greatest reason, and great temptation for it?

Why did not Pope Julius or Pope Liberius excommunicate Constantius the great favorer of the Arians, against whom Athanasius, St. Hilary, and Lucifer Calar. do so earnestly inveigh, calling him heretic, antichrist, and what not? How did Julian himself escape the censure of Pope Liberius? Why did not Pope Damasus thunder against Valens, that fierce persecutor of Catholics? Why did not Damasus censure the empress Justina, the patroness of Arianism? Why did not Pope Siricius censure Theodosius I. for that bloody fact, for which St. Ambrose denied him the communion? How was it that Pope Leo I. (that stout and high pope) had not the heart to correct Theodosius Junior in this way, who was the supporter of his adversary Dioscorus, and the obstinate protector of the second Ephesine council, which that Pope so much detested? Why did not that Pope rather compel that emperor to reason by censures, than supplicate him by tears? How did so many popes connive at Theodoric, and other princes professing Arianism at their door? Wherefore did not Pope Simplicius or Pope Felix thus punish the emperor Zeno, the supplanter of the synod of Chalcedon, for which they had so much zeal? Why did neither Pope Felix, nor Pope Gelasius, nor Pope Symmachus, nor Pope Hormisdas, excommunicate the emperor Anastasius, (yea, did not so much, Pope

* Greg. M. post Epist. xxxviii. lib. 2.

† Epist. pars. vii.

Gelasius saith, as "touch his name,"*) for countenancing the oriental bishops in their schism, and refractory non-compliance with the papal authority? Those popes did indeed clash with that emperor, but they expressly deny that they did condemn him with others whom he did favor. "We," saith Pope Symmachus, "did not excommunicate thee, O emperor, but Acacius.—If you mingle yourself, you are not excommunicated by us, but by yourself."† And, "If the emperor pleaseth to join himself with those condemned," saith Pope Gelasius, "it cannot be imputed to us."

Wherefore Baronius doth ill, in affirming Pope Symmachus to have anathematised Anastasius:‡ whereas that Pope plainly denied that he had excommunicated him, yea, denied it even in those words which are cited to prove it, being rightly read:§ for they are corruptly written in Baronius and Binius; *ego* (which hath no sense, or one contradictory to his former assertion) being put for *nego*, which is good sense, and agreeable to what he and the other Popes do affirm in relation to that matter.

Why do we not read that any Pope formally did excommunicate, though divers did zealously contradict and oppose, the princes who did reject images?

In fine, a noble bishop above five hundred years ago did say, "I read and read again the records of the Roman kings and emperors, and I nowhere find that any of them before this was excommunicated or deprived of his kingdom by the Roman Pontiff."‖

Surely therefore the ancient Popes did either not know their power, or were very negligent of their duty.

Such have been the doctrine and behavior of Popes in reference to their power.

§. V. This doctrine of the Pope's universal power over all persons in all matters may reasonably be supposed the sentiment of all Popes continually for a long time, even for more than five hundred years unto this present day. For,

1. If this doctrine be false, it implieth no slight error, but one of a very high nature and most dangerous consequence; which involveth great arrogance and iniquity, which tendeth to work enormous wrongs and grievous mischiefs: whence, if any Pope should conceive it false, he were bound openly to disclaim, to condemn, to refute it; lest the authority of his prede-

* P. Gelas. I. Epist. 4.
† P. Symmachus I. Ep. 7. P. Gelas. I. Ep. 4.
‡ An. 503. §. 17. § P. Sym. Ep. 7.
‖ Otho Frising. Chron. lib. vi. cap. 35.

cessors, and his connivance, should induce others into it, or settle them in it; as it is (in regard to Pope Honorius) charged on Pope Leo II. "who did not, as it became the apostolical authority, extinguish the flame of heretical doctrine beginning, but did by neglecting cherish it."* In such a case a Pope must not be silent: for, "No small danger," saith Pope Gelasius, "lieth on Popes in being silent about what agreeth to the service of God:"† and "If," saith Pope Paschal, "a Pope by his silence doth suffer the Church to be polluted with the gall of bitterness and root of impiety, he should nowise be excusable before the Eternal Judge:"‡ and, "Error," saith Pope Felix III. "which is not resisted, (by those in eminent office,) is approved; and truth which is not defended, is oppressed:"§ and, "He is not free from suspicion of a close society in mischief, who ceaseth to obviate it:"|| and, "We," saith Pope Gregory I. "do greatly offend, if we do hold our peace at things that are to be corrected."¶ But all Popes since the time specified have either openly declared for this doctrine, or have been silent, and so have avowed it by tacit consent.

2. Any popes disapproving that tenet were bound to renounce communion with those that hold and profess it; or at least to check and discountenance it. But on the contrary they have suffered it to be maintained in their presence and audience; and have hugged that sort of men with especial favor, as their most affectionate and sure friends: they have suspected, discountenanced, and frowned on those who have showed dislike of it.

Those men indeed who vouch this doctrine, may reasonably be deemed to do it as accomplices with the Popes, on purpose to gratify and curry favor with them, in hopes of obtaining reward and preferment of them for it.

3. The chief authors and most zealous abettors of these notions (Popes, synods, doctors of the school) have continually passed for most authentic masters of divinity, and have retained greatest authority in the Church governed and guided by the Pope.

4. The decrees containing them do stand in their canon law, and in their collections of synods, without any caution or mark of dislike; which is a sufficient indication of their constant adherence to this doctrine.

5. The common style of the papal edicts or bulls doth im-

* P. Leo II. Ep. 2. † P. Gelas. I. Ep. 8. (ad Anastas. Imp.)
‡ P. Paschal. II. Ep. 3. (ad Anselm. Cant.)
§ P. Felix III. Ep. 1. (ad Acacium.) || Id. ibid.
¶ P. Greg. I. Ep. ii. 37.

port their sense; which is imperious, in regard to all persons without exception: "Let no man" (say they) "presume to infringe this our will and command," &c.

6. Popes of all tempers and qualifications (even those who have passed for the most wise and moderate among them) have been ready to practise according to those principles, when occasion did invite, and circumstances of things did permit; interdicting princes, absolving subjects from their allegiance, raising or encouraging insurrections; as appeareth by their transactions not long since against our princes, and those of France; which shows the very see imbued with those notions.

7. They do oblige all bishops most solemnly to avow this doctrine, and to engage themselves to practise according to it. For in the oath prescribed to all bishops they are required to avow that "they will observe the apostolical commands with all their power, and cause them to be observed by others;" that "they will aid and defend the Roman papacy and the royalties of St. Peter against every man;" that "they will to their power persecute and impugn heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the Pope or his successors," without any exception; which was, I suppose, chiefly meant against their own prince, (if occasion should be;) together with divers other points, importing their acknowlegement and abetting the Pope's universal domination.

These horrible oaths of bishops to the Pope do seem to have issued from the same shop with the high Hildebrandine dictates: for the oath in the Decretals is ascribed to Pope Gregory, (I suppose Gregory VII.) And in the sixth Roman synod under Gregory VII. there is an oath of like tenor exacted from the bishop of Aquileia; perhaps occasionally, which in pursuance of that example might be extended to all.

And that before that time such oaths were not imposed doth appear from hence; that when Pope Paschal II. did require them from some great bishops, (the bishop of Palermo, and the archbishop of Poland,) they did wonder and boggle at it, as an uncouth novelty; nor doth the Pope, in favor of his demand, allege any ancient precedent, but only proposeth some odd reasons for it. "You have signified unto me, most dear brother, that the king and his nobles did exceedingly wonder, that an oath with such a condition should be everywhere offered you by my commissioners, and that you should take that oath, which I had written, and they tendered to you."*

§. VI. All Romanists, in consistence with their principles,

* P. Pasch. II. Ep. 6.

do seem obliged to hold this opinion concerning the Pope's universal power. For, seeing many of their standing masters and judges of controversies have so expressly from their chair declared and defined it; all the row for many ages consenting to it and countenancing it; not one of them having signified any dissent or dislike of it: and considering that, if in any thing they may require or deserve belief, it is in this point; for in what are they more skilful and credible, than about the nature of their own office? "What," saith Bellarmine wisely, "may they be conceived to know better than the authority of their own see?"* Seeing it hath been approved by their most great and famous councils, which they hold universal, and which their adored synod of Trent doth allege for such, (the Laterane under Pope Innocent III. that of Lyons under Pope Innocent IV. the other Laterane under Pope Leo X.) seeing it hath been current among their divines of greatest vogue and authority, the great masters of their school; seeing by so large a consent and concurrence, during so long a time, it may pretend (much better than divers other points of great importance) to be confirmed by tradition or prescription; why should it not be admitted for a doctrine of the holy Roman Church, "the mother and mistress of all churches?" How can they who disavow this notion be true sons of that mother, or faithful scholars of that mistress? How can they acknowlege any authority in their Church to be infallible, or certain, or obliging to assent?

How can they admit the Pope for authentic judge of controversies, or master of Christian doctrine, or in any point credible, who hath in so great a matter erred so foully, and seduced the Christian world; whom they desert in a point of so great consideration, and influence on practice; whom they, by virtue of their dissent from him in this opinion, may often be obliged to oppose in his proceedings?

How can they deny that bad doctrines might creep in, and obtain sway in the Church, by the interest of the Pope and his clients?

How can they charge novelty or heterodoxy on those who refuse some dictates of Popes, of papal councils, of scholastic divines, which stand on no better grounds than those on which this doctrine standeth?

Why hath no synod, of the many which have been held in all parts of Christendom, clearly disclaimed this opinion; but all have let it slip, or have seemed by silence to approve it?

* Bell. iv. 3.

Yea, how can the concord and unity of that Church well consist with a dissent from this doctrine? For,

No man apprehending it false, seemeth capable with good conscience to hold communion with those who profess it; for, on supposition of its falsehood, the Pope and his chief adherents are the teachers and abettors of the highest violation of divine commands, and most enormous sins; of usurpation, tyranny, imposture, perjury, rebellion, murder, rapine, and all the villanies complicated in the practical influence of this doctrine.

It seemeth clear as the sun, that if this doctrine be an error, it is one of the most pernicious heresies that ever was vented; involving the highest impiety, and producing the greatest mischief. For, if he that should teach adultery, incest, simony, theft, murder, or the like crimes, to be lawful, would be a heretic; how much more would he be such, that should recommend perjury, rebellion, regicide, (things inducing wars, confusions, slaughters, desolations, all sorts of injustice and mischief,) as duties?

How then can any man falsely hold communion with such persons? May we not say with Pope Symmachus, that "to communicate with such, is to consent with them?"* with Pope Gelasius, that "it is worse than ignorance of the truth to communicate with the enemies of truth?" and, that "he who communicateth with such an heresy is worthily judged to be removed from our society?"

§. VII. Yet so loose and slippery are the principles of the party which is jumbled in adherence to the Pope, that divers will not allow us to take this tenet of infinite power to be a doctrine of their Church; for divers in that communion do not assent to it.

For there is a sort of heretics (as Bellarmine and Baronius call them) skulking everywhere in the bosom of their Church, all about Christendom, and in some places stalking with open face, who restrain "the Pope's authority so far, as not to allow him any power over sovereign princes in temporal affairs; much less any power of depriving them of their kingdoms and principalities."†

"They are all branded for heretics, who take from the Church of Rome, and the see of St. Peter, one of the two swords, and allow only the spiritual."‡ This heresy Baronius hath nominated the "heresy of the politics."

* P. Sym. I. Ep. 7. P. Gelas. I. Ep. 1. Id. ibid. Vide Ep. xiii. p. 642.

† Bell. V. 1.

‡ Baron. anno 1053. §. 14. Hæresis Politicorum, Baron. an. 1073. §. 13.

This heresy a great nation, otherwise sticking to the Roman communion, doth stiffly maintain, not enduring the Papal sovereignty over princes in temporals to be preached in it.

There were many persons, yea, synods, who did oppose Pope Hildebrand in the birth of his doctrine, condemning it for a pernicious novelty, and branding it with the name of heresy; as we before showed.

Since the Hildebrandine age there have been in every nation (yea, in Italy itself) divers historians, divines, and lawyers, who have in elaborate tracts maintained the royal sovereignty against the pontifical.

This sort of heretics are now so much increased, that the Hildebrandine doctrine is commonly exploded. Which, by the way, showeth that the Roman party is no less than others subject to change its sentiments; opinions among them gaining and losing vogue, according to circumstances of time and contingencies of things.

§. VIII. Neither are the adherents to the Roman Church more agreed concerning the extent of the Pope's authority even in spiritual matters.

For, although the Popes themselves plainly do claim an absolute supremacy in them over the Church; although the stream of divines who do flourish in favor with them doth run that way; although, according to their principles, (if they had any principles clearly and certainly fixed,) that might seem to be the doctrine of their Church: yet is there among them a numerous party, which doth not allow him such a supremacy, putting great restraints to his authority; (as we shall presently show.) And as the other party doth charge this with heresy, so doth this return back the same imputation on that.

§. IX. That their doctrine is in this matter so various and uncertain, is no great wonder; seeing interest is concerned in the question, and principles are defective toward the resolution of it.

1. Contrary interests will not suffer the point to be decided, nor indeed to be freely disputed on either hand.

On one hand, the Pope will not allow his prerogatives to be discussed; according to that maxim of the great Pope Innocent III. "When there is a question touching the privileges of the apostolic see, we will not that others judge about them."* Whence (as we before touched) the Pope did peremptorily command his legates at Trent, in no case to permit any dispute about his authority.

On the other hand, the French will not permit the supremacy

* Greg. Decr. lib. ii. tit. 1. cap. 12.

of their king in temporals, or the privileges of their Church in spirituals, to be contested in their kingdom. Nor, we may suppose, would any prince admit a decision prejudicial to his authority and welfare, subjecting and enslaving him to the will of the Roman court. Nor (we may hope) would any Church patiently comport with the irrecoverable oppression of all its rights and liberties by a peremptory establishment of papal omnipotency.

2. Nor is it easy for their dissensions to be reconciled on theological grounds, and authorities to which they pretend deference. For, not only their schools and masters of their doctrine do in the case disagree, but their synods do notoriously clash.

§. X. Yea, even Popes themselves have shifted their pretences, and varied in style, according to the different circumstances of time, and their variety of humors, designs, interests.

In time of prosperity and on advantage, when they might safely do it, any Pope almost would talk high, and assume much to himself: but when they were low, or stood in fear of powerful contradiction, even the boldest Popes would speak submissly or moderately. As, for instance, Pope Leo I. after the second Ephesine synod, when he had to do with Theodosius II., did humbly supplicate, and whine pitifully; but after the synod of Chalcedon, having got the emperor favorable, and most of the bishops complacent to him, he ranted bravely. And we may observe that even Pope Gregory VII. who did swagger so boisterously against the Emperor Henry, was yet calm and mild in his contests with our William the Conqueror; who had a spirit good enough for him, and was far out of his reach.

And Popes of high spirit and bold face, (such as Leo I. Gelasius I. Nic. I. Gregory II. Gregory VII. Innocent III. Boniface VIII. Julius II. Paul IV. Sextus V. Paulus V., &c.) as they did ever aspire to screw papal authority to the highest peg; so would they strain their language in commendation of their see as high as their times would bear. But other Popes of meeker and modester disposition (such as Julius I. Anastasius II. Gregory I. Leo II. Adrian VI. &c.) were content to let things stand as they found them, or to speak in the ordinary style of their times; yet so, that few have let their authority to go backward or decline.

We may observe that the pretences and language of Popes have varied according to several periods, usually growing higher as their state grew looser from danger of opposition or control.

In the first times, while the emperors were pagans, their pretences were suited to their condition, and could not soar high; they were not then so mad as to pretend to any temporal power, and a pittance of spiritual eminency did content them.

When the empire was divided, they could sometimes be more haughty and peremptory; as being in the west, shrouded under the wing of the emperors there, (who commonly did affect to improve their authority, in competition to that of other bishops,) and at distance from the reach of the eastern emperor.

The cause of Athanasius having produced the Sardican canons, concerning the revision of some causes by the Popes, by color of them they did hugely enlarge their authority, and raise their style; especially in the west, where they had great advantages of augmenting their power.

When the western empire was fallen, their influence on that part of the empire which came under protection of the eastern emperors rendering them able to do service or disservice to those emperors, they, according to the state of times, and the need of them, did talk more big, or more tamely.

Pope Boniface III. having by compliance with the usurper Phocas obtained a declaration from him concerning the headship of the Roman Church, did make a considerable step forward toward the height of papal greatness.

After that Pope Gregory II. had withdrawn Italy from the oriental empire, and Rome had grown in a manner loose and independent from other secular powers; in the confusions of the west, the Pope interposing to arbitrate between princes, trucking and bartering with them, as occasion served, for mutual aid and countenance, did grow in power, and answerably did advance his pretences.

The spurious Decretal Epistles of the ancient Popes (which asserted to the Pope high degrees of authority) being foisted into men's hands, and insensibly creeping into repute, did inspire the Pope with confidence to invade all the ancient constitutions, privileges, and liberties of churches; and having got such interest everywhere, he might say what he pleased, no clergyman daring to check or cross him. Having drawn to himself the final decision of all causes, having got a finger in disposal of all preferments; having by dispensations, exemptions, and grants of privileges, tied to him so many dependents, what might not he say or do?

Pope Gregory VII. being a man of untamable spirit, and taking advantage from the distractions and corruptions of his times, did venture to pull a feather with the emperor; and with

success having mated him, did set up a peremptory claim to sovereignty over all persons in all causes.

In his footsteps his successors have trodden, being ever ready on occasion to plead such a title, and to practise according to it. No Pope would forego any power which had been claimed by his predecessors. And Popes would ever be sure to have dancers after their pipe, numberless abettors of their pretences.

No wonder then that persons deferring much regard to the authority of Popes, and accommodating their conceits to the dictates of them, (or of persons depending on them,) should in their opinions vary about the nature and extent of papal authority; it having never been fixed within certain bounds, or having in several ages continued the same thing.

§. XI. Wherefore intending by God's help to discuss the pretended authority of the Pope, and to show that he by no divine institution, and by no immutable right, hath any such power as he doth claim; by reason of this perplexed variety of opinions I do find it difficult to state the question, or to know at what distinct mark I should level my discourse.

§. XII. But seeing his pretence to any authority in temporals, or to the civil sword, is so palpably vain, that it hardly will bear a serious dispute, having nothing but impudence and sophistry to countenance it; seeing so many in the Roman communion do reject it, and have substantially confuted it; seeing now most are ashamed of it, and very few (even among those sects which have been its chief patrons) will own it; seeing Bellarmine himself doth acknowlege it a novelty, devised about five hundred years ago in St. Bernard's time;* seeing the Popes themselves, whatever they think, dare now scarce speak out, and forbear on sufficient provocation to practise according to it; I shall spare the trouble of meddling with it, confining my discourse to the Pope's authority in ecclesiastical affairs; the pretence whereto I am persuaded to be no less groundless, and no less noxious than the other to Christendom; the which being overthrown, the other, as superstructed on it, must also necessarily fall.

§. XIII. And here the doctrine which I shall contest against is that in which the cordial partisans of that see do seem to consent, which is most common and current, most applauded and countenanced in their theological schools; which the Popes themselves have solemnly defined, and declared for standing law or rule of jurisdiction; which their most authentic synods (whereby their religion is declared, and distinguished

* Bell. v. 5.

from others) have asserted or supposed; which the tenor of their discipline and practice doth hold forth; which their clergy by most solemn professions and engagements is tied to avow; which all the clients and confidents of Rome do zealously stand for, (more than for any other point of doctrine;) and which no man can disclaim without being deemed an enemy or a prevaricator toward the apostolic see.

§. XIV. Which doctrine is this, that (in the words of the Florentine synod's definition) "the apostolical chair and the Roman high-priest doth hold a primacy over the universal church; and that the Roman high-priest is the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and the true lieutenant of Christ, and the head of the Church; and that he is the father and doctor of all Christians; and that unto him," in St. Peter, "full power is committed to feed, and direct, and govern the Catholic Church under Christ; according as is contained in the Acts of General Councils, and in the Holy Canons."*

That (in the words of Pope Leo X. approved by the Laterane synod) "Christ, before his departure from the world, did in solidity of the rock institute Peter and his successors to be his lieutenants, to whom it is so necessary to obey, that who doth not obey must die the death."†

That to the Pope, as sovereign monarch, by divine sanction of the whole church, do appertain royal prerogatives, (*regalia Petri*, the royalties of Peter, they are called in the oath prescribed to bishops.) Such as these which follow:

To be superior to the whole church, and to its representative, a general synod of bishops. To convocate general synods at his pleasure; all bishops being obliged to attend on summons from him. To preside in synods, so as to suggest matter, promote, obstruct, overrule the debates in them. To confirm or invalidate their determinations, giving like to them by his assent, or subtracting it by his dissent. To define points of doctrine, or to decide controversies authoritatively; so that none may presume to contest, or dissent from his dictates. To enact, establish, abrogate, suspend, dispense with ecclesiastical laws and canons. To relax or evacuate ecclesiastical censures by indulgence, pardon, &c. To void promises, vows, oaths, obligations to laws by his dispensation. To be the fountain of all pastoral jurisdiction and dignity. To constitute, confirm, judge, censure, suspend, depose, remove, restore, reconcile bishops. To confer ecclesiastical dignities and benefices

* Concil. Flor. defin. p. 854. † P. Leo X. in Conc. Later. Sess. xi. p. 151.

by paramount authority, in way of provision, reservation, &c. To exempt colleges, monasteries, &c. from jurisdiction of their bishops and ordinary superiors. To judge all persons in all spiritual causes, by calling them to his cognisance, or delegating judges for them, with a final and peremptory sentence. To receive appeals from all ecclesiastical judicatories; and to reverse their judgments, if he findeth cause. To be himself unaccountable for any of his doings, exempt from judgment, and liable to no reproof. To erect, transfer, abolish episcopal sees. To exact oaths of fealty and obedience from the clergy. To found religious orders; or to raise a spiritual militia for propagation and defence of the church. To summon and commissionate soldiers by croisade, &c. to fight against infidels, or persecute infidels.

Some of these are expressed, others in general terms couched in those words of Pope Eugenius, telling the Greeks what they must consent unto. "The Pope," said he, "will have the prerogatives of his Church; and he will have appeals to him; and to feed all the Church of Christ, as shepherd of the sheep. Beside these things, that he may have authority and power to convoke general synods, when need shall be; and that all the patriarchs do yield to his will."*

That the Pope doth claim, assume, and exercise a sovereignty over the Church endowed with such prerogatives, is sufficiently visible in experience of fact, is apparent by the authorised dictates in their canon law, and shall be distinctly proved by competent allegations, when we shall examine the branches of this pretended authority.

In the mean time it sufficeth to observe, that in effect all clergymen do avow so much, who *bona fide* and without prevarication do submit to take the oaths and engagements prescribed to them of course by papal appointment. For this surely, according to the Pope's meaning, (by which their obligation is to be measured,) is designed in the profession ordained by Pope Pius IV. wherein every beneficed clergyman is enjoined to say, "And I do promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, and the vicar of Jesus Christ."† Which profession was appointed in pursuance of a sanction made by the Trent Council, that all such persons "should vow and swear to abide in obedience to the Roman Church;"‡ and consequently, how hard soever its yoke should be, they would not shake it off: which inferreth most absolute

* Conc. Flor. p. 846. † Bull. Pii IV. super forma juram.
‡ Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiv. cap. 12.

sovereignty of that Church, or of the Pope, who ruleth the roast in it.

But what that true obedience doth import, or how far the papal authority in the Pope's own sense, and according to the public spirit of that Church, doth stretch, is more explicitly signified in the oath which all bishops at their consecration, and all metropolitans at their instalment, are required to take; the which, as it is extant in the Roman Pontifical,* set out by order of Pope Clement VIII. doth run in these terms:

"I N. elect of the Church of N. from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman church, and to our lord, the lord N. Pope N. and to his successors, canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, nor do any thing that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized or hands anywise laid on them, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel which they shall intrust me withal, by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman papacy, and the royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the apostolic see, going and coming, I will honorably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman church, of our lord the Pope, and his foresaid successors, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman Church, any thing to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honor, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power; and as soon as I can will signify it to our said lord, or to some other, by whom it may come to his knowlege. The rules of the holy Fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, or his foresaid successors, I will to my power persecute and oppose. I will come to a council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the Apostles every three years; and give an account to our lord and his foresaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things anywise be-

* Pontif. Rom. Antwerp. anno 1626. p. 59. 86.

longing to the state of my Church, to the discipline of my clergy and people, and, lastly, to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto specially impowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage; or in default of these, by a priest of the diocese; or in default of one of the clergy, [of the diocese,] by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things abovementioned. And such impediment I will make out by lawful proofs to be transmitted by the foresaid messenger to the cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the congregation of the sacred council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell, nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor anywise alienate, no, not even with the consent of the chapter of my Church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God and these holy gospels of God."

Such is the oath prescribed to bishops, the which is worth the most serious attention of all men, who would understand how miserably slavish the condition of the clergy is in that Church, and how inconsistent their obligation to the Pope is with their duty to their prince.

And in perusing it we may note, that the clauses in a different character are in the more ancient oath extant in the Gregorian Decretals:* by which it appeareth how the Pope doth more and more enlarge his power, and straiten the bands of subjection to him. And it is very remarkable that the new oath hath changed those words, *regulas sanctorum Patrum* into *regalia Sancti Petri*, that is, the rules of the holy fathers into the royalties of St. Peter.

§. XV. I know there are within the Roman communion great store of divines, who do contract the papal sovereignty within a much narrower compass, refusing to him many of those prerogatives, yea, scarce allowing to him any of them.

There are those who affirm the Pope, in doctrine and discipline, subject to the Church, or to a general synod representing it. Which opinion thwarteth a proposition, in Bellarmine's opinion, "even almost an article of faith:" but to be even with

* Lib. ii. tit. 24. cap. 4.

him, they do hold his proposition to be quite heretical: "The Pope is simply and absolutely above the universal Church;"—"this proposition is almost an article of faith," saith Bellarmine:* the cardinal of Lorrain on the contrary, "But I," saith he, "cannot deny but that I am a Frenchman, and bred up in the Church of Paris, which teaches that the Roman Pontiff is subject to a council, and they who teach the contrary are there branded as heretics."†

There are those who affirm the Pope, if he undertake points of faith without assistance of a general synod, may teach heresy; (which opinion, as Bellarmine thought, doth "closely border on heresy:"‡) and those who conceive that Popes may be and have been heretics; whence Christians sometimes are not obliged to admit their doctrine, or observe their pleasure.

There are those who maintain the Pope, no less than other bishops, subject to the canons, or bound to observe the constitutions of the Church; that he may not infringe them, or overrule against them, or dispense with them: and that to him attempting to do so obedience is not due.

There are those who maintain that the Pope cannot subvert or violate the rights and liberties of particular churches, settled in them agreeably to the ancient canons of the Church universal.

There are those who assert to general councils a power of reforming the Church, without or against the Pope's consent.

There are those who, as Bellarmine§ telleth us, do allow the Pope to be no more in the ecclesiastical republic, than as the Duke of Venice in his senate, or as the general of an order in his congregation; and that he therefore hath but a very limited and subordinate power.

There are consequently those who conceive the Pope notoriously erring, or misdemeaning himself, to the prejudice of the Christian state, may be called to an account, may be judged, may be corrected, may be discarded by a general synod.

Such notions have manifestly prevailed in a good part of the Roman communion, and are maintained by most divines in the French Church; and they may be supposed everywhere common, where there is any liberty of judgment, or where the inquisition doth not reign.

There have been seasons wherein they have so prevailed, as

* Bell. de Conc. ii. 17.
† Card. Loth. apud Laun. Ep. i. 1. ‡ Bell. iv. 2.
§ Bell. de Conc. ii. 14.

to have been defined for Catholic truths in great synods, and by them to have been applied to practice. For,

In the first great synod of Pisa it was declared that councils "may reform the Church sufficiently both in head and members:"* and accordingly that synod did assume to judge two Popes (Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII.) contending for the papacy, (whereof one was the true Pope,) and deposing them both, did substitute Alexander V. "who for one year, (as Antoninus reporteth,) according to the common opinion, did hold the seat of Peter."†

The synod of Constance declared that "the synod lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, making a general council representing the Catholic Church militant, hath immediately power from Christ; to which every one, of whatever state or dignity he be, although it be papal, is bound to obey in those things which belong to faith, and the extirpation of (the said) schism, and the general reformation of the Church of God in head and members."

The which doctrine they notably put in practice, exercising jurisdiction over Popes, and for errors, misdemeanors, or contumacies, discarding three, (of whom it is hard if one were not true Pope,) and choosing another, who afterwards did pass for a right Pope, and himself did confirm the acts of that council. (So that this semi-heresy hath at least the authority of one Pope to countenance it.) "Our most holy lord the Pope said in answer thereunto, that he would maintain and inviolably observe all and every of those things that were conciliarly determined, concluded, and decreed, by the present council, in matters of faith."‡

The synod of Basil declared the same point, "that councils are superior to Popes, to be a truth of Catholic faith, which whoever doth stiffly oppose is to be accounted a heretic:§ "Nor (say they) did any skilful man ever doubt the Pope to be subject to the judgment of general synods in things concerning faith."|| In virtue of which doctrine, and by its irresistible authority, the synod did sentence and reject Pope Eugenius as criminal, heretical, and contumacious.¶

These synods, although reprobated by Popes in counter-synods, are yet by many Roman Catholic divines retained in great veneration; and their doctrine is so current in the fa-

* An. 1409. Conc. Pis. Sess. 16. 17.
† Anton. de Concil. Pis. cap. v. § 3.
‡ Conc. Const. Sess. xlv. p. 1119.
§ Conc. Bas. Sess. xxxiii. p. 95.
|| Ibid. xlv. p. 117.
¶ Sess. xxxviii. p. 101.

mous Sorbonne, that (if we may believe the great Cardinal of Lorrain) the contrary is there reputed heretical.

§. XVI. Yet notwithstanding these oppositions, the former opinion averring the Pope's absolute sovereignty, doth seem to be the genuine doctrine of the Roman Church, if it hath any.

For those divines, by the Pope and his intimate confidents, are looked on as a mongrel brood, or mutinous faction; which he by politic connivance doth only tolerate, because he is not well able to collect or suppress them. He is afraid to be violent in reclaiming them to his sense, lest he spend his artillery in vain, and lose all his power and interest with them.

Nor indeed do those men seem to adhere to the Roman party out of intire judgment or cordial affection; but in compliance with their princes, or on account of their interest, or at best with regard to peace and quiet. They cannot conveniently break with the Pope, because his interest is twisted with their own, so as not easily to be disentangled.

For how can they heartily stick to the Pope, whenas their opinion doth plainly imply him to be an usurper and a tyrant, (claiming to himself, and exercising authority over the Church, which doth not rightfully belong to him;) to be a rebel and traitor against the Church, (invading and possessing the sovereignty due to it; for such questionless the Duke of Venice would be, should he challenge and assume to himself such a power over his commonwealth, as the Pope hath over Christendom;) to be an impostor and seducer, pretending to infallible conduct, which he hath not.

How can they honestly condemn those who (on such grounds) do shake off such yokes, refusing to comply with the Pope, till he correct his errors, till he desist from those usurpations and impostures, till he restore to the Church its rights and liberties?

How are the doctrines of those men consistent or congruous to their practice? For they call the Pope monarch of the Church, and universal pastor of Christians, by God's appointment, indefectibly; yet will they not admit all his laws, and reject doctrines which he teacheth, particularly those which most nearly touch him, concerning his own office and authority. They profess themselves his loyal subjects, yet pretend liberties which they will maintain against him. They hold that all are bound to entertain communion with him, yet confess that he may be heretical, and seduce into error. They give him the name and shadow of a supremacy, but so that they can void the substance and reality thereof.

In fine, where should we seek for the doctrine of the Roman Church but at Rome, or from Rome itself? where these doctrines are heterodoxies.

§. XVII. We shall not therefore have a distinct regard to the opinion of these semi-Romanists; nor consider them otherwise, than to confirm that part of truth which they hold, and to confute that part of error which they embrace; allowing, at least in word and semblance, more power to the Pope, than we can admit as due to him. Our discourse shall be levelled at him as such as he pretendeth himself to be, or as assuming to himself the forementioned powers and prerogatives.

§. XVIII. Of such vast pretences we have reason to require sufficient grounds. He that demandeth assent to such important assertions, ought to produce clear proofs of them: he that claimeth so mighty power, should be able to make out a good title to it; for, "No man may take this (more than pontifical) honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as was Aaron. They are worthily to be blamed, who tumultuously and disorderly fall on curbing or restraining those who by no law are subject to them."*

We cannot well be justified from a stupid easiness, in admitting such a lieutenancy to our Lord, if we do not see exhibited to us manifest and certain patents assuring its commission to us. We should love the Church better, than to yield up its liberty to the will of a pretender, on slight or no ground. Their boldly claiming such a power, their having sometime usurped such a power, will not excuse them or us. Nor will precarious assumptions, or subtle distinctions, or blind traditions, or loose conjectures serve for probations in such a case.

§. XIX. Such demands they cannot wholly balk: wherefore for satisfaction to them, not finding any better plea, they hook in St. Peter; affirming that on him by our Lord there was instated a primacy over his brethren, all the Apostles and the disciples of our Lord, importing all the authority which they claim; and that from him this primacy was devolved by succession to the bishops of Rome, by right indefectible for all future ages.

Which plea of theirs doth involve these main suppositions,

I. That St. Peter had, by our Lord's appointment, a primacy over the Apostles.

II. That St. Peter's primacy with its rights and prerogatives was not personal, but derivable to his successors.

III. That St. Peter was bishop of Rome.

* Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 17.

IV. That St. Peter did continue bishop of Rome, after his translation, and was so at his decease.

V. That the bishops of Rome (according to God's institution, and by original right derived thence) should have an universal supremacy and jurisdiction over the Christian Church.

VI. That in fact the Roman bishops continually from St. Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this sovereign power.

VII. That this power is indefectible and unalterable.

The truth and certainty of these propositions we shall in order discuss; so that it may competently appear, whether those who disclaim these pretences are (as they are charged) guilty of heresy and schism; or they rather are liable to the imputations of arrogancy and impiety who do obtrude and urge them.

A TREATISE OF THE

POPE'S SUPREMACY.

MATTHEW, CHAP. X.—VERSE 2.

Now the names of the twelve Apostles were these; the first, Simon, who is called Peter.

AMONG the modern controversies there is scarce any of greater consequence than that about universal supremacy, which the Bishop of Rome claimeth over the Christian church; the assertion whereof on his side dependeth on divers suppositions; namely these.

I. That St. Peter by our Lord's appointment had a primacy, implying a sovereignty of authority and jurisdiction over the Apostles.

II. That the rights and prerogatives of this sovereignty were not personal, but derivable, and transmitted to successors.

III. That St. Peter was bishop of Rome.

IV. That St. Peter did continue bishop of Rome after his translation, and was so at his decease.

V. That hence of right to the bishops of Rome, as St. Peter's successors, an universal jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ doth appertain.

VI. That in fact the said bishops continually from St. Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this power.

VII. That this power is indefectible; such as by no means can be forfeited or fail.

In order to the discussion and resolution of the first point, I shall treat on the primacy of St. Peter: endeavoring to show what primacy he was capable of, or might enjoy; what he could not pretend to, nor did possess.

SUPPOSITION I.

The first Supposition of those who claim universal jurisdiction to the Pope over the church is, "That St. Peter had a primacy over the Apostles."

In order to the resolution of this point, we may consider that there are several kinds of primacy, which may belong to a person in respect of others: for there are,

1. A primacy of worth, or personal excellency.
2. A primacy of reputation and esteem.
3. A primacy of order, or bare dignity and precedence.
4. A primacy of power or jurisdiction.

To each of these what title St. Peter might have, let us in order examine.

I. As for the first of these, (a primacy of worth, or merit, as some of the ancients call it,) we may well grant it to St. Peter, admitting that probably he did exceed the rest of his brethren in personal endowments and capacities, (both natural and moral,) qualifying him for the discharge of the apostolical office in an eminent manner; particularly that in quickness of apprehension, in boldness of spirit, in readiness of speech, in charity to our Lord, and zeal for his service, in resolution, activity, and industry he was transcendent, may seem to appear by the tenor of the evangelical and apostolical histories; in the which we may observe him on all occasions ready to speak first, and to make himself the mouth, as the Fathers speak, of the Apostles, in all deliberations nimble at propounding his advice, in all undertakings forward to make the onset; being παντaχοῦ θερμὸς, always hot and eager, always prompt and vigorous, as St. Chrysostom often affirmeth concerning him: these things are apparent in his demeanor, and it may not be amiss to set down some instances.*

When our Lord observing the different apprehensions men had concerning him, asked the Apostles, 'But whom say ye that I am?' up starteth he, προπηδᾷ καὶ προλαμβάνεται, 'he skippeth forth, and preventeth the rest, crying, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' The other Apostles were not ignorant of the point;† for they at their conversion did take Jesus for the Messias, which (even according to the common notion of the Jews) did imply his being the Son of God;

* Cyrill. in Joh. xxi. 15. Chrys. in Joh. Or. xii. (13. 24.) Ibid. tom. v. Or. 59.

† Ambr. in Luc. lib. vi. cap. 9.

Nathanael (that is, St. Bartholomew, as is supposed) had in terms confessed it; the whole company, on seeing our Lord walk on the sea, had avowed it; St. Peter before that in the name of them all had said, 'Ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν, καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν, 'We have believed, and have known, that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' They therefore had the same faith, but he, from a special alacrity of spirit, and expedition in utterance, was more forward to declare it; "He was more hot," saith St. Gregory Nazianzen, "than the rest at acknowleging Christ."*

When our Saviour walked on the sea, who but he had the faith and the courage to venture on the waters towards him?

When our Lord was apprehended by the soldiers, presently up was his spirit, and out went his sword in defence of him.

When our Lord predicted that on his coming into trouble all the disciples would be offended, and desert him, he was ready to say, 'Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended;' and, 'Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee:' such was his natural courage and confidence.

When our Lord was discoursing about his passion, he suddenly must be advising in the case, and urging him 'to spare himself;' on which St. Chrysostom biddeth us to "consider, not that his answer was unadvised, but that it came from a genuine and fervent affection."†

And at the transfiguration, he fell to proposing about making an abode there, 'not knowing what he said;' so brisk was he in imagination and speech.

On the good woman's report that our Lord was risen from the dead, he first ran to the sepulchre, and so (as St. Paul implieth) did obtain the first sight of our Lord after the resurrection;‡ such was his zeal and activity on all occasions.

At the consultation about supplying the place of Judas, he rose up, proposed, and pressed the matter.

At the convention of the Apostles and elders about resolving the debate concerning observance of Mosaical institutions, he first rose up, and declared his sense.

In the promulgation of the gospel, and defence thereof before the Jewish rulers, he did assume the conduct, and constantly took on him to be the speaker; the rest standing by him, implying assent, and ready to avow his word: 'Peter,' saith St. Luke, 'standing with the rest, lift up his voice, and said unto

* Greg. Naz. Or. 34. † Tom. v. Or. 59.
‡ 1 Cor. xv. 5.

them;' so "did they utter a common voice," saith St. Chrysostom, "and he was the mouth of all."

That in affection to our Lord, and zeal for his service, St. Peter had some advantage over the rest, that question, 'Simon Peter, dost thou love me more than these?' may seem to imply:* (although the words πλεῖον τούτων may bear other interpretations, whereby the seeming invidiousness of the question, according to that sense, will be removed.) However, that he had a singular zeal for promoting our Lord's service, and propagation of the gospel, therein outshining the rest; seemeth manifest in the history, and may be inferred from the peculiar regard our Lord apparently did show to him.

On these premises we may well admit that St. Peter had a primacy of worth; or that in personal accomplishments he was most eminent among the twelve Apostles; (although afterward there did spring up one, who hardly in any of these respects would yield to him; who could confidently say, 'that he did not come behind the very chief Apostles;' and of whom St. Ambrose saith, "Neither was Paul inferior to Peter——being well to be compared even to the first, and second to none:"† and St. Chrysostom, "For what was greater than Peter, and what equal to Paul?" ‡) This is the primacy which Eusebius attributeth to him, when he calleth him "the excellent and great Apostle, who for his virtue was the prolocutor of all the rest."§

II. As to a primacy of repute; which St. Paul meaneth, when he speaketh of the οἱ δοκοῦντες, 'those which had a special reputation,' of those 'who seemed to be pillars,' of the ὑπὲρ λίαν Ἀπόστολοι, the supereminent Apostles; this advantage cannot be refused him; being a necessary consequent of those eminent qualities resplendent in him, and of the illustrious performances achieved by him, beyond the rest.

This may be inferred from that advantageous renown which he hath had propagated from the beginning to all posterity.

This at least those elogies of the Fathers (styling him the chief, prince, head of the Apostles) do signify.

This also may be collected from his being so constantly ranked in the first place, before the rest of his brethren.

III. As to a primacy of order, or bare dignity, importing that commonly, in all meetings and proceedings, the other

* Aug. in Joh. Tract. 123. Chrys. tom. v. Or. 24. Hier. in Mat. xvi. 22. Aug. Serm. xiii. de verb. Dom. in Matt. i.

† Ambr. de Sp. S. ii. 12. ‡ Chrys. tom. v. Or. 167.

§ Euseb. Hist. ii. 4.

Apostles did yield him the precedence, the προηγορία, or privilege of speaking first, (whether in propounding matters for debate, or in delivering his advice,) in the conduct and moderation of affairs; that this was stated on him may be questioned; for that this were a kind of womanish privilege; and that it doth not seem to befit the gravity of such persons, or their condition and circumstances, to stand on ceremonies of respect; for that also our Lord's rules do seem to exclude all semblance of ambition, all kinds of inequality and distance between his Apostles; for that this practice doth not seem constantly and thoroughly to agree to his being endowed with this advantage; especially seeing all that practice which favoreth it may fairly be assigned to other causes; for that also the Fathers' authority (if that be objected, as a main argument of such a primacy) in points of this nature, not bordering on essentials of faith, is of no great strength; they in such cases speaking out of their own ingeny and conjecture; and commonly indulging their imaginations no less freely than other men.

But yet this primacy may be granted, as probable on divers accounts of use and convenience; it might be useful to preserve order, and to promote expedition; or to prevent confusion, distraction, and dilatory obstruction in the management of things; yea, to maintain concord, and to exclude that ambition or affectation to be foremost, which is natural to men.

For seeing all could not go, speak, or act first, all could not guide affairs, it was expedient that one should be ready to undertake it, knowing his cue; "See" (saith St. Chrysostom, noting on Acts ii. 14. where St. Peter speaketh for the rest) "the concord of the Apostles; they yield unto him the speech, for they could not all speak:"* and, "One," saith St. Jerome, "is chosen among the twelve, that a head being appointed, an occasion of schism might be removed."†

St. Cyprian hath a reason for it somewhat more subtle and mystical,‡ supposing our Lord did confer on him a preference of this kind to his brethren, (who otherwise in power and authority were equal to him,) that he might intimate and recommend unity to us; and the other African doctors (Opatus and St. Austin) do commonly harp on the same notion:§ I can discern little solidity in this conceit, and as little harm.

However, supposing this primacy, (at least in respect to the Fathers, who generally seem to countenance it,) divers pro-

* Chrys. in Act. ii. 14.
† Hier. in Jovin. i. cap. 14.
‡ Ep. 73. de Unit. Eccl. &c.
§ Aug. de Bapt. iii. 17.

bable reasons may be assigned, why it should especially be conferred on St. Peter.

1. It is probable that St. Peter was first in standing among the Apostles; I mean not that he was the first disciple, or first converted to faith in Christ; but first called to the apostolical office; or first nominated by our Lord, when out of all his disciples 'he chose twelve, and called them Apostles; Simon, whom he called Peter, and Andrew his brother.'* He was one of the first believers at large; he was perhaps the first that distinctly believed our Lord's divinity; he was probably the very first Apostle; as that the fittest person in our Lord's eye for that employment.† "He," saith St. Hilary, "did first believe, and is the prince (or first man) of the apostleship."‡ "He," saith St. Cyprian, "was the first whom the Lord chose."§ "He," saith St. Basil, "was by judgment preferred before all the disciples."|| He by other ancients is called the first-fruits of the Apostles.¶ And according to this sense St. Jerome, I suppose, doth call him and his brother Andrew, *principes Apostolorum*, that is, (according to frequent usage of the word *princeps* in Latin,) the first of the Apostles.**

So that as in divers churches, (perhaps when time was, in all,) anciently, priority in ordination did ground a right to precedence, as it is in ours, with some exception; so might St. Peter, on this account of being first ordained Apostle, obtain such a primacy.

2. St. Peter also might be the first in age; which among persons otherwise equal is a fair ground of preference; for he was a married man; and that before he was called, as is intimated in St. Luke; and may be inferred from hence, that he would not have married after that he had left all, and devoted himself to follow our Lord. On which account of age St. Jerome did suppose that he was preferred before the beloved disciple; "Why," saith he, "was not St. John elected, being a bachelor? it was deferred to age, because Peter was elder, that a youth, and almost a boy, might not be preferred before men of good age."††

I know that Epiphanius‡‡ affirmeth St. Andrew to have been the elder brother; but it doth not appear whether he saith it from conjecture, or on any other ground. And his authority,

* Theoph. in Matt. x. † Epiph. Hær. 51.
‡ Hil. in Matt. Can. 7. § Cypr. Ep. 71.
|| Bas. de Judicio Dei, tom. ii. p. 268.
¶ Modest. apud Phot. Cod. 275. Clem. ad Jac.
** Hier. in Jovin. 1. †† Ibid. i. 14. ‡‡ Epiph. hær. 51.

although we should suppose it bottomed on tradition, is not great; tradition itself in such matters being very slippery, and often one tradition crossing another.

3. The most eminent qualifications of St. Peter (such as we before described) might procure to him this advantage.

They might breed in him an honest confidence, pushing him forward on all occasions to assume the former place, and thence by custom to possess it; for *qui sibi fidit, dux regit examen*—it being in all action, as in walking, where he that naturally is most vigorous and active doth go before the rest.

They might induce others to a voluntary concession thereof;* for to those who indisputably do excel in good qualities or abilities, honest and meek persons easily will yield precedence, especially on occasions of public concernment; wherein it is expedient that the best qualified persons should be first seen.

They probably might also move our Lord himself to settle, or at least to insinuate this order; assigning the first place to him, whom he knew most willing to serve him, and most able to lead on the rest in his service.

It is indeed observable that on all occasions our Lord signified a particular respect to him, before the rest of his colleagues; for to him more frequently than to any of them he directed his discourse; unto him, by a kind of anticipation, he granted or promised those gifts and privileges which he meant to confer on them all; him he did assume as spectator and witness of his glorious transfiguration; him he picked out as companion and attendant on him in his grievous agony; his feet he first washed; to him he did first discover himself after his resurrection, (as St. Paul implieth,) and with him then he did entertain most discourse, in especial manner recommending to him the pastoral care of his Church: by which manner of proceeding our Lord may seem to have constituted St. Peter the first in order among the Apostles, or sufficiently to have hinted his mind for their direction, admonishing them by his example to render unto him a special deference.

4. The Fathers commonly do attribute his priority to the merit of his faith and confession, wherein he did outstrip his brethren. "He obtained supereminent glory by the confession of his blessed faith,"† saith St. Hilary. "Because he alone of all the rest professeth his love," (John xxi.) "therefore he is preferred above all,"‡ saith St. Ambrose.

5. Constantly in all the catalogues of the Apostles, St. Peter's

* Chrys. in Act. ii. 14. † Hil. de Trin lib. vi. p. 121.
‡ Ambr. in Luc. cap. ult.

name is set in the front; and when actions are reported, in which he was concerned jointly with others, he is usually mentioned first, which seemeth not done without careful design, or special reason.

On such grounds it may be reasonable to allow St. Peter a primacy of order; such a one as the ringleader hath in a dance, as the primipilar centurion had in the legion, or the prince of the senate had there, in the Roman state; at least, as among earls, baronets, &c., and others coordinate in degree, yet one hath a precedence of the rest.

IV. As to a primacy, importing superiority in power, command, or jurisdiction; this by the Roman party is asserted to St. Peter, but we have great reason to deny it, on the following considerations.

1. For such a power (being of so great importance) it was needful that a commission from God, its founder, should be granted in downright and perspicuous terms; that no man concerned in duty grounded thereon, might have any doubt of it, or excuse for boggling at it; it was necessary, not only for the Apostles, to bind and warrant their obedience, but also for us, because it is made the sole foundation of a like duty incumbent on us; which we cannot heartily discharge without being assured of our obligation thereto, by clear revelation, or promulgation of God's will in the holy Scripture; for it was of old a current, and ever will be a true rule, which St. Austin in one case thus expresseth, "I do believe that also on this side there would be most clear authority of the Divine oracles, if a man could not be ignorant of it without damage of his salvation;"* and Lactantius thus, "Those things can have no foundation, or firmness, which are not sustained by any oracle of God's word."†

But apparently no such commission is extant in Scripture; the allegations for it being, as we shall hereafter show, nowise clear, nor probably expressive of any such authority granted by God; but on the contrary divers clearer testimonies are producible derogating from it.

2. If so illustrious an office was instituted by our Saviour, it is strange that nowhere in the evangelical or apostolical history (wherein divers acts and passages of smaller moment are recorded) there should be any express mention of that institution; there being not only much reason for such a report, but many pat occasions for it: the time when St. Peter was vested with that authority; the manner and circumstances of his instalment

* Aug. de Pec. Mer. et Rem. ii. 36. † Lact. vii. 2.

therein; the nature, rules, and limits of such an office, had surely well deserved to have been noted, among other occurrences relating to our faith and discipline, by the holy evangelists; no one of them, in all probability, could have forborne punctually to relate a matter of so great consequence, as the settlement of a monarch in God's church, and a sovereign of the apostolical college; (from whom so eminent authority was to be derived to all posterity, for compliance wherewith the whole church for ever must be accountable;) particularly it is not credible that St. Luke should quite slip over so notable a passage, who had, as he telleth us, 'attained a perfect understanding of all things, and had undertaken to write in order the things that were surely believed among Christians' in his time; of which things, this, if any, was one of the most considerable.

3. The time of his receiving institution to such authority can hardly be assigned. For was it when he was constituted by our Lord an Apostle? Then indeed probably he began to obtain all the primacy and preeminence he ever had; but no such power doth appear then conferred on him, or at any time in our Saviour's life; at least, if it was, it was so covertly and indiscernibly, that both he himself and all the Apostles must be ignorant thereof, who a little before our Lord's passion did more than once earnestly contest about superiority. And it is observable that whereas our Lord before his passion did carefully teach and press on the Apostles the chief duties which they were to observe in their behavior toward each other; the maintenance of peace, of charity, of unity, of humility toward one another; yet of paying due respect and obedience to this superior he said nothing to them.

The collation of that power could not well be at any time before the celebration of our Lord's Supper, because before that time St. Peter was scarce an ecclesiastical person; at least he was no priest, as the convention of Trent under a curse doth require us to believe;* for it were strange that an unconsecrated person, or one who was not so much as a priest, should be endowed with so much spiritual power.

After his resurrection, our Lord did give divers common instructions, orders, and commissions to his Apostles, but it doth not appear that he did make any peculiar grant to St. Peter; for as to the pretence of such an one drawn out of the appendix to St. John's Gospel, or grounded on the words *Pasce oves*, we shall afterward declare that to be invalid.

4. If St. Peter had been instituted sovereign of the aposto-

* Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii. Can. 2.

lical senate, his office and state had been in nature and kind very distinct from the common office of the other Apostles; as the office of a king from the office of any subject; as an ordinary, standing, perpetual, successive office, from one that is only extraordinary, transitory, temporal, personal, and incommunicable; (to speak according to distinctions now in use, and applied to this case;) whence probably, as it was expedient to be, it would have been signified by some distinct name, or title, characterising it, and distinguishing it from others; as that of Arch-apostle, Arch-pastor, High Priest, Sovereign Pontiff, Pope, his Holiness, the Vicar of Christ, or the like; whereby it might have appeared that there was such an officer, what the nature of his office was, what specialty of respect and obedience was due to him: but no such name or title (on any occasion) was assumed by him, or was by the rest attributed to him, or in history is recorded concerning him; the name of an Apostle being all that he took on him, or by others was given to him.

5. There was indeed no office above that of an Apostle known to the Apostles, or to the primitive church; this, saith St. Chrysostom, was the greatest authority, and the top of authorities;* there was, saith he, none before an Apostle, none superior, none equal to him: this he asserteth of all the Apostles, this he particularly applieth to St. Paul; this he demonstrateth from St. Paul himself, who purposely enumerating the chief officers instituted by God in his church, doth place Apostles in the highest rank; 'Our Lord,' saith St, Paul, 'gave some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers;' and God hath set some in 'his church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers;' πρῶτον Ἀποστόλους; why not first a pope, an universal pastor, an œcumenical judge, a vicar of Christ, a head of the Catholic church? Could St. Paul be so ignorant, could he be so negligent or so envious, as to pass by, without any distinction, the supreme officer, if such a one then had been? As put case, that one should undertake to recite the officers in any state, or republic, would he not do strangely, if he should pretermit the king, the duke, the consul, the major thereof? Would not any one confiding in the skill, diligence, and integrity of such a relator, be induced from such an omission to believe there was no such officer there? St. Chrysostom therefore did hence very rationally infer that the apostolical office was the supreme in the Christian state, having no other superior to it.

* Chrys. tom. viii. p. 114. tom. v. Or. 33.

St. Peter therefore was no more than an Apostle; and as such he could have no command over those who were in the same highest rank coordinate to him, and who as Apostles could not be subject to any.

6. Our Lord himself, at several times, declared against this kind of primacy, instituting equality among his Apostles, prohibiting them to affect, to seek, to assume, or admit a superiority of power one above another.

There was (saith St. Luke, among the twelve, at the participation of the holy supper) 'a strife among them, who of them should be accounted the greatest,' or who had the best pretence to superiority: this strife our Lord presently did check and quash; but how? not by telling them that he already had decided the case in appointing them a superior, but rather by assuring them that he did intend none such to be; that he would have no monarchy, no exercise of any dominion or authority by one among them over the rest; but that notwithstanding any advantages one might have before the other, (as greater in gifts,* or as preceding in any respect,) they should be one as another, all humbly condescending to one another, each being ready to yield help and service to one another; 'The kings,' said he, 'of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority over them are called benefactors: but ye shall not be so; but he that is greater among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is leader, as he that doth minister;' that is, whatever privilege any of you obtaineth, let it not be employed in way of command, but rather of compliance and subserviency, as occasion shall require; let him not pretend to be a superior, but rather behave himself as an inferior: thus our Lord did smother the debate, by removing from among them whatever greatness any of them did affect or pretend to; forbidding that any of them should κυριεύειν, or ἐξουσιάζειν, exercise any dominion or authority over the rest, as worldly princes did over their subjects.

Again, on another occasion, (as the circumstances of the place do imply,) when two of the Apostles (of special worth and consideration with our Lord, St. James and St. John, the sons of Zebedee) did affect a preeminence over the rest, requesting of our Lord, 'Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory,' (or, 'in thy kingdom,' as St. Matthew hath it; that is, in that new state which they conceived our Lord was ready to introduce;) which request doth not seem to import any great matter

* Clem. ad Corinth. i. p. 63. apud Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. p. 466.

of authority; nor probably did they desire so much, as our adversaries do give to St. Peter; yet our Lord doth not only reject their suit, but generally declareth that none of them were capable of such a preferment in his kingdom; which therein differed from worldly dominion, because in it there was no room for such an ambition; especially in that state of things wherein the Apostles were to be placed; which was a state of undergoing persecutions, not of enjoying dignity, or exercising command; all the preferment which they reasonably could aspire to being to be dispensed in the future state, (whereof they were not aware,) according to God's preparation, in correspondence to the patience and industry any of them should exert in God's service; (on which account St. Chrysostom saith,) 'it was a clear case that St. Paul should obtain the preference.'*

It was indeed (as our Lord intimateth) incongruous for those who had forsaken all things for Christ, who had embraced a condition of disgrace, who were designed by self-denial, humility, neglect of temporal grandeur, wealth, and honor, by undergoing persecution, and undertaking conformity to our Lord, ('being baptised with the baptism with which he was baptised,') to propagate the faith of a crucified Master, to seek or take on them authoritative dignity; for among them there could not well be any need of commanding or being commanded;† it was more fit that all of them should conspire to help and serve one another, in promoting the common design and service of their Lord, with mutual condescension and compliance; which was the best way of recommending themselves to his acceptance, and obtaining from him answerable reward. Such was the drift of our Lord's discourse; whereunto (as in the other case) he did annex the prohibition of exercising dominion; 'Ye know,' saith he, 'that the princes of nations exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority on them: but it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be first among you, let him be your servant:' Ὅς ἐὰν θέλῃ, whoever among you hath a mind to special grandeur and preeminence, let him understand that there is no other to be attained, beside that which resulteth from the humble performance of charitable offices to his brethren; the which whoever shall best discharge, he alone will become greatest and highest in the eye of God.

Again, at another time the Apostles dreaming of a secular

* Chrys. tom. v. Or. 33. † Chrys. in Act. i. 6.

kingdom to be erected by our Lord, 'disputed among themselves who should be the greatest;' and for satisfaction presumed to inquire of our Lord about it; when, as they surely were very ignorant of St. Peter's being their head, so there was a fair occasion as could be of our Lord's instructing them in that point, and enjoining their duty towards him; but he did not so, but rather taught him, together with the rest, not to pretend to any such thing as preferment above the rest; 'He sitting down, called the twelve, and said unto them, If any one desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all.' How could he (considering the occasion and circumstances of that speech) in plainer terms establish equality, or discountenance any claim to superiority among them? Had St. Peter then advanced such a plea, as they now affirm of right belonging to him, would he not thereby have depressed and debased himself to the lowest degree?

To impress this rule, our Lord* then 'calling a little child, did set him in the midst of them,' telling them that 'except they were converted,' (from such ambitious pretences,) 'and became like little children,' (wholly void of such conceits,) 'they could not enter into the kingdom of heaven:' that is, could not in effect be so much as ordinary good Christians; adjoining that 'whosoever should humble himself as did that little child,' (not affecting, or assuming more than such an innocent did,) 'should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven:' in real worth, and in the favor of God, transcending the rest; so that St. Peter claiming superiority to himself, would have forfeited any title to eminency among Christians.

Again, as to the power which is now ascribed to St. Peter by the party of his pretended successors, we may argue from another place; where our Saviour prohibiting his disciples to resemble the Jewish scribes and pharisees in their ambitious desires and practices, their affectations of preeminence, their assuming places and titles importing difference of rank and authority, he saith, 'But be ye not called Rabbi: for there is one Master (one Guide or Governor) of you, even Christ; but ye are brethren.' How more pregnantly could he have declared the nature of his constitution, and the relation of Christians one to another established therein, to exclude such differences of power, whereby one doth in way of domination impose his opinion or his will on others!

Ye are all fellow-scholars, fellow-servants, and fellow-children of God; it therefore doth not become you to be any-

* Clem. Alex. Strom. v. (p. 409.)

wise imperious over one another: but all of you humbly and lovingly to conspire in learning and observing the precepts of your common Lord; the doing which is backed with a promise, and a threat suitable to the purpose; 'He that exalteth himself shall be abased: and he that will abase himself shall be exalted;' the which sentences are to be interpreted according to the intent of the rules foregoing.

If it be said that such discourse doth impugn all ecclesiastical jurisdiction; I answer, that indeed thereby is removed all such haughty and harsh rule, which some have exercised over Christians; that *αὐθεντία*, (arbitrary power;) that *ἐξουσία ἀνεύθυνος*, (absolute, uncontrollable authority;) that *τυραννικὴ προνομία*, (tyrannical prerogative,) of which the Fathers complain; that *κατακυριεύειν τῶν κλήρων*, (domineering over their charges,) which St. Peter forbiddeth. "We," saith St. Chrysostom,* "were designed to teach the word, not to exercise empire or absolute sovereignty; we do bear the rank of advisers, exhorting to duty."

A bishop, saith St. Jerome, differeth from a king, in that a bishop presideth over those that are willing, the king against their will;† (that is, the bishop's governance should be so gentle and easy, that men hardly can be unwilling to comply with it; but should obey, as St. Peter exhorteth, (*οὐκ ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀλλ' ἑκουσίως*, 'not by constraint, but of their own accord;') and, 'Let,' saith he, 'the bishops be content with their honor; let them know themselves to be fathers, not lords; they should be loved, not feared.'‡

And, "Thou" (saith St. Bernard to Pope Eugenius) "dost superintend, the name of bishop signifying to thee not dominion, but duty."§

At least those precepts of our Lord do exclude that power which is ascribed to St. Peter over the Apostles themselves, the which indeed is greater than in likelihood any pharisee did ever affect; yea in many respects doth exceed any domination which hath been claimed or usurped by the most absolute monarch on earth; for the power of St. Peter in their opinion was the same which now the Roman bishop doth challenge to himself over the pastors and people of God's Church, by virtue of succession to him, (St. Peter's power being the base of the papal, and therefore not narrower than its superstructure;)

* Chrys. in Eph. Or. 11.
† Hier. Ep. 3. ad Nepot. Chrys. in Tit. i. 7.
‡ Hier. Ep. 62. ad Theoph. cap. 3. Ibid. cap. 1.
§ Bern. de Consid. ii. 6.

but what domination comparable to that hath ever been used in the world?

What emperor did ever pretend to a rule so wide in extent, (in regard either to persons or matters,) or so absolute in effect?

Who ever, beside his Holiness, did usurp a command, not only over the external actions, but the most inward cogitations of all mankind; subjecting the very minds and consciences of men to his dictates, his laws, his censures?

Who ever thundered curses and damnations on all those who should presume to dissent from his opinion, or to contest his pleasure?

Who ever claimed more absolute power, in making, abolishing, suspending laws, or imposing on men what he pleased, under obligation of conscience, and on extremest penalties?

What prince ever used a style more imperious than is that which is usual in the papal bulls; "Let it be lawful for no man whatever to infringe this expression of our will and command, or to go against it with bold rashness."

What Domitian more commonly did admit the appellation of Lord, than doth the Pope? 'Our most Holy Lord,'* is the ordinary style attributed to him by the Fathers of Trent, as if they were his slaves, and intended to enslave all Christendom to him.

Who ever did exempt his clients and dependents in all nations from subjection to civil laws, from undergoing common burdens and taxes, from being judged or punished for their misdemeanors and crimes?

Who ever claimed a power to dispose of all things one way or other, either directly or indirectly? to dispose even of kingdoms, to judge sovereign princes, and to condemn them, to depose them from their authority, absolving their subjects from all allegiance to them, and exposing their kingdoms to rapine?

To whom but a Pope were ever ascribed prerogatives like those of judging all men, and himself being liable to no judgment, no account, no reproof or blame; so that, as a papal canon assureth us, "let a Pope be so bad, as by his negligence and maladministration to carry with him innumerable people to hell, yet no mortal man whatever must presume here to reprove his faults; because he being to judge all men, is himself to be judged of no man, except he be catched swerving from the faith;"† which is a case they will hardly suffer a man to suppose possible.

To whom but to a Pope was such power attributed by his

* Concil. Trid. Sess. xxii. cap. 11. &c. † Grat. Dist. xl. cap. 6.

followers, and admitted by himself, that he could hear those words applying to him, "All power is given to thee in heaven and in earth?"

Such power the Popes are wont to challenge, and when occasion serveth do not fail to execute, as successors of St. Peter;* to whom therefore consequently they ascribe it: and sometimes in express terms; as in that brave apostrophe of Pope Gregory VII. (the spirit of which Pope hath possessed his successors generally;) "Go to therefore, (said he, directing his speech to St. Peter and St. Paul,) most holy princes of the Apostles, and what I have said confirm by your authority; that now at length all men may understand, whether ye can bind and loose; that also ye can take away and give on earth, empires, kingdoms, and whatever mortal men can have.' †

Now if the assuming and exercising such powers be not that κατακυριεύειν, and κατεξουσιάζειν, that exalting one's self, that being called rabbi, father, master, which our Lord prohibiteth, what is so? what then can those words signify? what could our Lord mean?

The authority therefore which they assign to St. Peter, and assume to themselves from him, is voided by those declarations and precepts of our Lord; the which it can hardly be well conceived that our Lord would have proposed, if he had designed to constitute St. Peter in such a supremacy over his disciples and Church.

7. Surveying particulars, we shall not find any peculiar administration committed to St. Peter, nor any privilege conferred on him, which was not also granted to the other Apostles.

Was St. Peter an ambassador, a steward, a minister, a vicar, (if you please,) or surrogate of Christ? so were they, by no less immediate and express warrant than he; for, 'As the Father sent me, so also I send you,' said our Lord presently before his departure; by those words, as St. Cyprian remarketh, 'granting an equal power to all the Apostles:' ‡ and, 'We,' saith St. Paul, 'are ambassadors for Christ; we pray you in Christ's stead, be reconciled to God:' and, 'So let a man esteem us, as the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.'

Was St. Peter a rock, on which the Church was to be founded? Be it so; but no less were they all; for the wall of Jerusalem, which 'came down from heaven,' had 'twelve

* Excommun. Henrici R. in Concil. Rom. iii. sub Greg. VII. apud Bin. tom. vii. p. 484.

† Plat. in Greg. VII. In Concil. Rom. vi. apud Bin. p. 491.

‡ Cypr. de Un. Eccl.

foundations, on which were inscribed the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb;' and, 'We,' saith St. Paul, 'are all built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Christ himself being the chief corner stone;' whence "equally," saith St. Jerome, "the strength of the Church is settled on them."*

Was St. Peter an architect of the spiritual house (as himself calleth the Church)? so were also they; for, 'I,' saith St. Paul, 'as a wise master-builder, have laid the foundation.'

Were the keys of the Church (or of the kingdom of heaven) committed to him? so also were they unto them: they had a power to open and shut it by effectual instruction and persuasion, by dispensation of the sacraments, by exercise of discipline, by exclusion of scandalous and heretical persons; whatever faculty the keys did import, the Apostles did use it in the foundation, guidance, and government of the Church; and did (as the Fathers teach) impart it to those whom they did in their stead constitute to feed and govern the Church.

Had St. Peter a power given him of binding and loosing effectually? so had they, immediately granted by our Saviour, in as full manner, and couched in the same terms; 'If thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound in heaven,' saith our Lord to him; and, 'Whatsoever things ye shall bind on earth, they shall be bound in heaven,' said the same divine mouth to them.†

Had he a privilege to remit and retain sins? it was then by virtue of that common grant or promise; 'Whosesoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.'

Had he power and obligation to feed the sheep of Christ (all or some)? so had they indefinitely and immediately: so had others by authority derived from them; who were nominated pastors; who had this charge laid on them: 'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood;' whom he doth himself exhort, 'Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof:' let feeding signify what it can, instruction, or guidance, or governance, or all of them together, (*Regio more impera*, if you please, as Bellarmine will have it,) it did appertain to their charge; to teach was a common duty, to lead and to rule were common functions; St. Peter could not, nor would not appropriate it to himself; it is his own exhortation, when he taketh most on him, 'Be mindful of the

* Hier. in Jovin. i. 14. † Phot. Cod. 280. p. 1600.

commandment (or precept) of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour.'

Was his commission universal, or unlimited? so was theirs, by the same immediate authority; for, 'All power (said he to them, when he gave his last charge) is given to me in heaven and in earth; go therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you;' and 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.'

They, as St. Chrysostom speaketh, "were all in common intrusted with the whole world, and had the care of all nations."*

Was he furnished with extraordinary gifts, with special graces, with continual directions and assistances for the discharge of the apostolical office? so were they; for the promise was common of sending the Holy Spirit, 'to lead them into all truth,' and 'clothing them with the power from on high;' and of endowing them with power to perform all sorts of miraculous works; our Lord before his departure 'breathed into them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost;' 'All of them,' saith St. Luke, 'were filled with the Holy Ghost;' all of them with confidence and truth could say, 'It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us;" all of them did abundantly partake of that character which St. Paul respected, when he did say, 'The signs of an Apostle were wrought among you, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.'

Did St. Peter represent the church as receiving privileges in its behalf; as the Fathers affirm?† so did they, according to the same Fathers; "If therefore" (saith St. Austin, citing the famous place, *Sicut me misit Pater*) "they did bear the person of the Church, and this was said to them, as if it were said to the Church itself, then the peace of the Church remitteth sins."‡

What singular prerogative then can be imagined appertaining to St. Peter? what substantial advantage could he pretend to beyond the other Apostles? Nothing surely doth appear; whatever the patrons of his supremacy do claim for him is precariously assumed, without any fair color of proof; he for it is beholding, not to any testimony of Holy Scripture, but to the invention of Roman fancy: we may well infer with Cardinal Cusanus;§ "We know that Peter did not receive more power from Christ than the other Apostles; for nothing was said to Peter, which was not also said to the other: therefore," addeth

* Chrys. tom. viii. p. 115. Tom. v. Orat. 47. in 2 Cor. xi. 28.
† Aug. Ep. 165. ‡ Aug. de Bapt. cont. Dom. iii. 18.
§ Card. Cus. de Conc. Cath. ii. 13.

he, "we rightly say, that all the Apostles were equal to Peter in power."

8. Whereas St. Peter himself did write two Catholic Epistles, there doth not in them appear any intimation, any air or savor of pretence to this arch-apostolical power. It is natural for persons endowed with unquestionable authority, (howsoever otherwise prudent and modest,) to discover a spice thereof in the matter or in the style of their writing; their mind, conscious of such advantage, will suggest an authoritative way of expression; especially when they earnestly exhort, or seriously reprove, in which cases their very authority is a considerable motive to assent or compliance, and strongly doth impress any other arguments; but no critic perusing those Epistles would smell a pope in them. The speech of St. Peter, although pressing his doctrine with considerations of this nature, hath no tang of such authority.

'The elders,' saith he, 'which are among you, I exhort, who also am an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed:' by such excellent but common advantages of his person and office, he presseth on the clergy his advices.

Had he been what they make him, he might have said, I, the peculiar vicar of Christ, and sovereign of the Apostles, do not only exhort, but require this of you: this language had been very proper, and no less forcible: but nothing like this, nothing of the spirit and majesty of a Pope, is seen in his discourse; there is no *pagina nostræ voluntatis et mandati*, which now is the papal style; when he speaketh highest, it is in the common name of the Apostles, 'Be mindful,' saith he, 'of the command (that is, of the doctrine and precepts) of us, the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour.

9. In the apostolical history, the proper place of exercising this power, ("wherein," as St. Chrysostom saith, "we may see the predictions of Christ, which he uttered in the gospels, reduced to act, and the truth of them shining in the things themselves,") no footstep thereof doth appear.*

We cannot there discern that St. Peter did assume any extraordinary authority, or that any deference by his brethren was rendered to him, as to their governor or judge. No instance there doth occur of his laying commands on any one Apostle, or exercising any act of jurisdiction on any one; but rather to the contrary divers passages are observable, which argue that

* Chrys. in Act. 1.

he pretended to no such thing, and that others did not understand any such thing belonging to him.

His temper indeed and zeal commonly did prompt him to be most forward in speaking and acting on any emergency for the propagation or maintenance of the gospel; and the memory of the particular charge which our Lord departing had lately put on him, strongly might instigate him thereto;* regard to his special gifts and sufficiency did incline the rest willingly to yield that advantage to him; and perhaps because on the considerations before touched they did allow some preference in order to him; but in other respects, as to the main administration of things, he is but one among the rest, not taking on him in his speech or behavior beyond others. All things are transacted by common agreement, and in the name of all concurring; no appeal in cases of difference is made singly to him; no peremptory decision or decree is made by him; no orders are issued out by him alone, or in a special way; in ecclesiastical assemblies he acteth but as one member; in deliberations he doth only propound his opinion, and passeth a single vote; his judgment and practice are sometime questioned, and he is put to render an account of them: he doth not stand on his authority, but assigneth reasons to persuade his opinion, and justify his actions; yea sometimes he is moved by the rest, receiving orders and employment from them: these things we may discern by considering the instances which follow.

In the designation of a new Apostle, to supply the place of Judas, he did indeed suggest the matter, and lay the case before them; he first declared his sense; but the whole company did choose two, and referred the determination of one to lot, or to God's arbitration.

At the institution of deacons, 'the twelve did call the multitude of disciples,' and directed them to elect the persons; and the proposal being acceptable to them, it was done accordingly; 'they chose Stephen,' &c. whom 'they set before the Apostles, and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.'†

In that important transaction about the observance of Mosaical institutions, a great stir and debate being started, which St. Paul and St. Barnabas by disputation could not appease, what course was then taken? did they appeal to St. Peter, as to the supreme dictator and judge of controversies? Not so; but 'they sent to the apostles and elders at Jerusa-

* Chrys. in Act. i. 15. 26. † Acts vi. 5.

lem, to inquire about the question :' when those great messengers were arrived there, 'they were received by the Church, and the apostles, and elders ;' and having made their report, 'the Apostles and elders did assemble to consider about that matter.' In this assembly, after much debate passed, and that many had freely uttered their sense, St. Peter rose up, with apostolical gravity, declaring what his reason and experience did suggest conducing to a resolution of the point; whereto his words might indeed be much available, grounded, not only on common reason, but on special revelation concerning the case; whereon St. James, alleging that revelation, and backing it with reason drawn from Scripture, with much authority pronounceth his judgment; 'Therefore,' saith he, 'I judge,'* (that is, saith St. Chrysostom, "I authoritatively say,") 'that we trouble not them, who from among the Gentiles are turned to God; but that we write unto them,' &c. And the result was, that according to the proposal of St. James, it was by general consent determined to send a decretal letter unto the Gentile Christians containing a canon, or advice directive of their practice in the case; 'It then seemed good to (or was decreed by) the apostles and elders, with the whole Church, to send'†—and the letter ran thus, 'The apostles, and elders, and brethren, to the brethren of the Gentiles.'—Now in all this action, (in this leading precedent for the management of things in ecclesiastical synods and consistories,) where can the sharpest sight descry any mark of distinction or preeminence which St. Peter had in respect to the other Apostles? Did St. Peter there anywise behave himself like his pretended successors on such occasions? what authority did he claim or use before that assembly, or in it, or after it? did he summon or convocate it? No; they met on common agreement. Did he preside there? No; but rather St. James, "to whom, (saith St. Chrysostom,) as bishop of Jerusalem, the government was committed."‡ Did he offer to curb or check any man, or to restrain him from his liberty of discourse there? No; 'there was much disputation,' every man frankly speaking his sense. Did he more than use his freedom of speech becoming an Apostle, in arguing the case and passing his vote? No; for in so exact a relation nothing more doth appear. Did he form the definitions, or pronounce the decree resulting? No; St.

* Διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω. Acts xv. 19. Τί ἐστι κρίνω ἐγώ, ἀντὶ τοῦ μετ' ἐξουσίας λέγω τοῦτο εἶναι.—Chrys.

† Acts xv. 22. xxi. 25.

‡ Chrys. tom. v. Or. 59. Chrys. in loc.

James rather did that; for, (as an ancient author saith.) "Peter did make an oration, but St. James did enact the law."* Was, beside his suffrage in the debate, any singular approbation required from him, or did he by any bull confirm the decrees? No such matter; these were devices of ambition, creeping on and growing up to the pitch where they now are. In short, doth any thing correspondent to papal pretences appear assumed by St. Peter, or deferred to him? If St. Peter was such a man as they make him, how wanting then was he to himself, how did he neglect the right and dignity of his office, in not taking more on him on so illustrious an occasion, the greatest he did ever meet with? How defective also were the Apostolical college, and the whole Church of Jerusalem, in point of duty and decency, yielding no more deference to their sovereign, the vicar of their Lord! Whatever account may be framed of these defailances, the truth is, that St. Peter then did know his own place and duty better than men do know them now; and the rest as well understood how it became them to demean themselves. St. Chrysostom's reflexions on those passages are very good, that indeed then "there was no fastuousness in the church," and "the souls of those primitive Christians were clear of vanity;"† the which dispositions did afterward spring up and grow rankly to the great prejudice of religion, begetting those exorbitant pretences which we now disprove.

Again, when St. Peter, being warned from heaven thereto, did receive Cornelius, a Gentile soldier, unto communion; divers good Christians, who were ignorant of the warrantableness of that proceeding, (as others commonly were, and St. Peter himself was, before he was informed by that special revelation,) did not fear διακρίνεσθαι πρὸς αὐτὸν, to contest with him about it; not having any notion (as it seemeth) of his supreme unaccountable authority, (not to say of that infallibility with which the Canonists and Jesuits have invested him;) unto whom St. Peter rendereth a fair account, and maketh a satisfactory apology for his proceedings; not browbeating those audacious contenders with his authority, but gently satisfying them with reason. But if he had known his power to be such, as now they pretend it to be, he should have done well to have asserted it, even out of goodwill and charity to those good brethren;‡ correcting their error, and checking their mis-

* Hesych. apud Phot. Cod. 275. † Chrys. ibid.

‡ Iren. iii. 12. N. In the matter at Antioch, St. Peter did comply with St. James and the Judaizers, which did not beseem such authority.

demeanor; showing them what an enormous presumption it was so to contend with their sovereign pastor and judge.

Farther: so far was St. Peter from assuming command over his brethren, that he was on occasion ready to obey their orders; as we may see by that passage, where, on the conversion of divers persons in Samaria, it is said that 'the Apostles hearing it, did send to them Peter and John, who going down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost.' The Apostles sent him: that, had he been their sovereign, would have been somewhat unseemly and presumptuous; for subjects are not wont to send their prince, or soldiers their captain; to be sent being a mark of inferiority, as our Lord himself did teach; 'A servant,' said he, 'is not greater than his Lord; nor he that is sent greater than he that sent him.' St. Luke therefore should at least have so expressed this passage, that the Apostles might have seemed to keep their distance, and observed good manners: if he had said they beseeched him to go, that had sounded well; but 'they sent him,' is harsh, if he were *Dominus noster Papa*, as the modern Apostles of Rome do style their Peter. The truth is, then among Christians there was little standing on punctilios; private considerations and pretences to power then took small place; each one was ready to comply with that which the most did approve; the community did take on it to prescribe unto the greatest persons, as we see again in another instance, where the brethren at Antioch did 'appoint Paul and Barnabas (the most considerable persons among them) to go up unto Jerusalem.'* They were then 'so generous, so merciful, so full of charity, as, rather than to cause or foment any disturbance, to recede, or go whither the multitude pleased, and do what was commanded by it.'

10. In all relations, which occur in Scripture, about controversies incident of doctrine or practice, there is no appeal made to St. Peter's judgment, or allegation of it as decisive; no argument is built on his authority: dissent from his opinion, or disconformity to his practice, or disobedience to his orders, are not mentioned as ground of reproof, as aggravation of any error, any misdemeanor, any disorder; which were very strange, if then he was admitted or known to be the universal prince and pastor of Christians or the supreme judge and arbitrator of controversies among them: for then surely the most clear, compendious, and effectual way to confute any error, or check any

* Acts xv. 2. xiii. 2. Clem. ad Cor. p. 69.

disorder, had been to allege the authority of St. Peter against it: who then could have withstood so mighty a prejudice against his cause? If now a question doth arise about any point of doctrine, instantly the parties (at least some one of them, which hopeth to find most favor) hath recourse to the Pope to define it; and his judgment, with those who admit his pretences, proveth sufficiently decisive, or at least greatly swayeth in prejudice to the opposite party. If any heresy, or any opinion disagreeing from the current sentiments, is broached, the Pope presently doth roar that his voice is heard through Christendom, and thundereth it down: if any schism or disorder springeth up, you may be sure that Rome will instantly meddle to quash it, or to settle matters as best standeth with its principles and interests: such influence hath the shadow of St. Peter's authority now: but no such regard was then had to poor Pope Peter himself; he was not so busy and stirring in such cases: the Apostles did not send heretics to be knocked down by his sentence, nor schismatics to be scourged by his censure; but were fain to use the long way of disputation, striving to convince them by testimonies of Scripture, and rational discourse. If they did use authority, it was their own; which they 'challenge as given to them by Christ for edification,' or on account of the more than ordinary gifts and graces of the divine Spirit, conferred on them by God.

11. St. Peter nowhere doth appear intermeddling as a judge or governor paramount in such cases; yea, where he doth himself deal with heretics and disorderly persons, confuting and reproving them, (as he dealeth with divers notoriously such,) he proceedeth not as a Pope decreeing, but as an Apostle warning, arguing, and persuading against them.

It is particularly remarkable how St. Paul, reproving the factions which were among Christians at Corinth, doth represent the several parties, saying, 'I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas, I am of Christ.' Now supposing the case then had been clear and certain, (and if it were not so then, how can it be so now?) that St. Peter was sovereign of the apostles, is it not wonderful that any Christian should prefer any apostle or any preacher before him? as if it were now clear and generally acknowleged that the Pope is truly what he pretendeth to be, would any body stand in competition with him, would any glory in a relation to any other minister before him?

It is observable how St. Clemens reflecteth on this contention; "Ye were," saith he, "less culpable for that partiality;

for ye did then incline to renowned Apostles, and to a man approved by them: but now,"* &c.

If it be replied that Christ himself did come into the comparison; I answer, that probably no man was so vain, as to compare him with the rest, nor indeed could any there pretend to have been baptised by him, (which was the ground of the emulation in respect of the others;) but those who said they were of Christ, were the wise and peaceable sort, who by saying so declined and disavowed faction; whose behavior St. Paul himself in his discourse commendeth and confirmeth, showing that all indeed were of Christ, the Apostles being only his ministers, to work faith and virtue in them. "None," saith St. Austin, "of those contentious persons were good, except those who said, But I am of Christ."†

We may also here observe that St. Paul, in reflecting on these contentions, had a fair occasion of intimating somewhat concerning St. Peter's supremacy, and aggravating their blameable fondness, who compared others with him.

12. The consideration of the Apostles proceeding in the conversion of people, in the foundation of churches, and in administration of their spiritual affairs, will exclude any probability of St. Peter's jurisdiction over them.

They went about their business, not by order or licence from St. Peter, but according to special instinct and direction of God's Spirit, ('being sent forth by the Holy Ghost;' 'going by revelation,') or according to their ordinary prudence, and the habitual 'wisdom given unto them;' by those aids (without troubling St. Peter or themselves more) they founded societies, they ordained pastors, they framed rules and orders requisite for the edification and good government of churches, reserving to themselves a kind of paramount inspection and jurisdiction over them; which in effect was only πατρικὴ ἐπιμέλεια, a paternal care over them; which they particularly claimed to themselves on account of spiritual parentage, for that they had begotten them to Christ; 'If,' saith St. Paul to the Corinthians, 'I am not an Apostle to others, I am however so to you:' why so? because he had converted them, and could say, 'As my beloved sons I warn you: for though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet ye have not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.' This paternal charge they did exercise without any dependence, or regard to St. Peter, none such appearing, it not being mentioned that they did ever consult his pleasure, or render him an account of

* Clem. ad Corinth. p. 61. † Aug. cont. Crescon. i. 27.

their proceedings; but it rather being implied in the reports of their actions, that they proceeded absolutely, by virtue of their universal office and commission of our Lord.

If it be alleged that St. Paul went to Jerusalem to St. Peter; I answer, that it was to visit him out of respect and love; or to confer with him for mutual edification and comfort; or at most to obtain approbation from him and the other Apostles, which might satisfy some doubters, but not to receive his commands or authoritative instructions from him; it being, as we shall afterwards see, the design of St. Paul's discourse to disavow any such dependence on any man whatever. So doth St. Chrysostom note: "What," saith he, "can be more humble than this soul? after so many and so great exploits, having no need at all of Peter, or of his discourse, but being in dignity equal to him, (for I will now say no more,) he yet doth go up to him, as to one greater and ancienter; and a sight alone of Peter is the cause of his journey thither."*—And, "He went," saith he again, "not to learn any thing of him, nor to receive any correction from him, but for this only, that he might see him, and honor him with his presence."

And indeed that there was no such deference of the Apostles to St. Peter, we may hence reasonably presume, because it would then have been not only impertinent and needless, but inconvenient and troublesome. For,

13. If we consider the nature of the apostolical office, the state of things at that time, and the manner of St. Peter's life; in correspondence to those things, he will appear uncapable or unfit to manage such a jurisdiction over the apostles as they assign him.

The nature of the apostolical ministry was such, that the apostles were not fixed in one place of residence, but were continually moving about the world, or *in procinctu*, ready in their gears to move whither divine suggestions did call them, or fair occasion did invite them, for the propagation or furtherance of the gospel.†

The state of things was not favorable to the apostles, who were discountenanced and disgraced, persecuted, and driven from one place to another, (as our Lord foretold of them;) Christians lay scattered about at distant places, so that opportunities of dispatch for conveyance of instructions from him, or of accounts to him, were not easily found.

‡St. Thomas preaching in Parthia, St. Andrew in Scythia,

* Chrys. in Gal. i. 18. † Chrys. in Joh. xxi. 23.
‡ Euseb. iii. 1. Niceph. ii. 38. 39. 40. Tertul. ad Jud. cap. 7.

St. John in Asia, Simon Zelotes in Britain, St. Paul in many places;* other Apostles and apostolical men in Arabia, in Ethiopia, in India, in Spain, in Gaul, in Germany, 'in the whole world, and in all the creation under heaven,' as St. Paul speaketh, could not well maintain correspondence with St. Peter; especially considering the manner of his life, which was not settled in any one known place, but moveable and uncertain; for he continually roved over the wide world, preaching the gospel, converting, confirming, and comforting Christian people, as occasion starting up did induce: how then could he conveniently dispense all about his ruling and judging influence? how in cases incident could direction be fetched from him, or reference be made to him by those subordinate governors, who could not easily know where to come at him, or whence to hear from him in any competent time? To send to him had been to shoot at rovers; affairs therefore which should depend on his resolution and orders must have had great stops; he could but very lamely have executed such an office; so that his jurisdiction must have been rather an extreme inconvenience and incumbrance, than anywise beneficial or useful to the Church.

'Gold and silver he had none,' or a very small purse, to maintain dependents and officers to help him' (nuncios, legates *a latere*, secretaries, auditors, &c.) infinity of affairs would have oppressed a poor helpless man; and to bear such a burden as they lay on him no one could be sufficient.

14. It was indeed most requisite that every Apostle should have a complete, absolute, independent authority in managing the concerns and duties of his office; that he might not anywise be obstructed in the discharge of them; not clogged with a need to consult others, not hampered with orders from those who were at distance, and could not well descry what was fit in every place to be done.

The direction of him who had promised to be 'perpetually present with them,' and by his Holy Spirit to guide, to instruct, to admonish them on all occasions, was abundantly sufficient; they did not want any other conduct or aid beside that special light and powerful influence of grace; which they received from him; the which ἱκάνωσεν αὐτοὺς, did, as St. Paul speaketh, 'render them sufficient ministers of the New Testament.'

Accordingly their discourse and practice do thoroughly savor of such an independence; not in them is there any ap-

* Bas. Seleuc. Or. 2.

pearance of that being true, which Bellarmine dictateth, that "the Apostles depended on St. Peter, as on their head and commander."*

15. Particularly the discourse and behavior of St. Paul towards St. Peter doth evince that he did not acknowlege any dependence on him, any subjection to him.

St. Paul doth often purposely assert to himself an independent and absolute power, inferior or subordinate to none other, insisting thereon for the enforcement or necessary defence of his doctrine and practice; ('I have become a fool in glorying;' 'ye have compelled me,' saith he;) alleging divers pregnant arguments to prove and confirm it, drawn from the manner of his call, the characters and warrants of his office, the tenor of his proceedings in the discharge of it, the success of his endeavors, the approbation and demeanor toward him of other Apostles.

As for his call and commission to the apostolical office, he maintaineth, (as if he meant designedly to exclude those pretences, that other Apostles were only called *in partem solicitudinis* with St. Peter,†) that he was 'an Apostle, not from men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father;' that is, that he derived not his office immediately or mediately from men, or by the ministry of any man, but immediately had received the grant and charge thereof from our Lord; as indeed the history plainly showeth, in which our Lord telleth him, that he did 'constitute him an officer, and a chosen instrument to him, to bear his name to the Gentiles.'

Hence he so often is careful and cautious to express himself an Apostle by the will and special grace, or favor and appointment, and command of God; and particularly telleth the Romans, that 'by Christ he had received grace and apostleship.'

For the warrant of his office, he doth not allege the allowance of St. Peter, or any other, but those special gifts and graces which were conspicuous in him, and exerted in miraculous performances; 'Truly,' saith he, 'the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds;' and, 'I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God.'

To the same purpose he allegeth his successful industry in converting men to the gospel; 'Am I not an Apostle?' saith he,

* Bellarm. de Pont. i. 16. † Bell. i. 9. 14. 16.

'are ye not my work in the Lord? If I am not an Apostle to others, I am surely one to you: for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord.' And, 'By the grace of God I am what I am; and his grace which was on me became not in vain, but I labored more abundantly than they all.'

In the discharge of his office, he immediately, (after that he had received his call and charge from our Saviour,) without consulting or taking licence from any man, did vigorously apply himself to the work; 'Immediately,' saith he, 'I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that before me were Apostles:' so little did he take himself to be accountable to any man.

In settling order, and correcting irregularities in the Church, he professed to act merely by his own authority, conferred on him by our Lord; 'Therefore,' saith he, 'being absent, I write these things, that being present I may not use severity, according to the authority which the Lord hath given me for edification, not for destruction.'

Such being the privileges which he did assert to himself with all confidence, he did not receive for it any check from other Apostles; but the chief of them, 'knowing the grace that was given unto him, gave unto him the right hand of fellowship;' in token of their acknowlegement and allowance of his proceedings.

On these considerations (plainly signifying his absolute independence in the reception and execution of his office) he doth more than once affirm (and in a manner boast) himself 'to be inferior in nothing to the very chief Apostles:' in nothing; that is, in nothing pertinent to the authority or substantial dignity of his place; for as to his personal merit he professeth himself 'much less than the least of the Apostles;' but as to the authenticness and authority of his office, he deemed himself equal to the greatest; 'being by the grace of God what he was; a minister of the gospel, according to the gift of the grace of God, which was given him according to the effectual working of his power.'

When he said he was 'behind none,' he could not forget St. Peter; when he said 'none of the chief,' he could not but especially mean him; (he did indeed, as St. Chrysostom saith, intend 'to compare himself with St. Peter;') when he said 'in nothing,' he could not but design that which was most considerable, the authority of his place; which in the context he did expressly mention. For when he objected to himself the semblance of fondness or arrogance in speaking after that manner,

he declared that he did not speak rashly or vainly, but on serious consideration, and with full assurance, finding it very needful or useful to maintain his authority, or to magnify his office, as he otherwhere speaketh.

If things had been, as now we are taught from the Roman school, it is strange that St. Paul should compare himself so generally, not excepting St. Peter; that he should express (nor by the least touch intimate) no special consideration for his, as they tell us, ordinary pastor;* that he should not consider how liable such words were to be interpreted in derogation to St. Peter's due prerogatives.

But it is no wonder that St. Paul, in St. Peter's absence, should thus stand on his own legs, not seeming to mind him, whenas in inmediate transactions with him he demeaned himself as his fellow, yielding to him no respect or deference, as to his superior. For,

When St. Paul went to Jerusalem, to have conference with St. Peter and other Apostles, who were chief in repute, he professeth that 'they did not confer any thing to him,' so as to change his opinion, or divert him from his ordinary course of practice, which was different from theirs: this was (it seemeth) hardly proper or seemly for him to say, if St. Peter had been his sovereign: but he seemeth to say it on very purpose, to exclude any prejudice that might arise to his doctrine from their authority or repute; their authority being none over him, their repute being impertinent to the case; for 'whatsoever,' addeth he, 'they were, it maketh no matter to me; God respecteth no man's person:' the which might well be said of persons greater in common esteem, but not so well of one who was his superior in office; to whose opinion and conduct, as of his judge and pastor by God's appointment, he did owe a special regard.

Again, St. Paul at Antioch, observing St. Peter out of fear and policy to act otherwise than became the simplicity and sincerity of Christians, to the prejudice of evangelical truth, charity, and liberty, against his own judgment and former practice, drawing others by his pattern into the same unwarrantable course of behavior, did 'withstand him to the face,' did 'openly reprove him before all, because he was blamable;' did, as Pope Gelasius I. affirmeth, (to excuse another pope misbehaving himself,) worthily confute him;† did (as St.

* Bell. de Pont. i. 11.

† Gelas. I. de Anath. (apud Bin. tom. iii. p. 645.)

Augustine often doth affirm and urge, in proof that greatest persons may sometimes err and fail) correct him, rebuke him, chide him.*

Which behavior of St. Paul doth not well consist with the supposition that St. Peter was his superior in office; if that had been, Porphyrius with good color of reason might have objected procacity to St. Paul in taxing his betters;† for he then indeed had showed us no commendable pattern of demeanor towards our governors, in so boldly opposing St. Peter, in so openly censuring him, in so smartly confuting him.

More unseemly also it had been to report the business as he doth in writing to the Galatians; for to divulge the miscarriages of superiors, to revive the memory of them, to register them, and transmit them down to all posterity, to set forth our clashing and contests with them, is hardly allowable; if it may consist with justice and honesty, it doth yet little savor of gravity and modesty: it would have been more seemly for St. Paul to have privately and humbly remonstrated to St. Peter, than openly and downrightly to have reprehended him; at least it would have become him in cold blood to have represented his carriage more respectfully, consulting the honor of the universal Pastor, whose reputation was like to suffer by such a representation of his proceedings. Pope Pelagius II. would have taught St. Paul better manners; who saith, that "they are not to be approved, but reprobated, who do reprove or accuse their prelates;"‡ and Pope Gregory would have taught him another lesson, namely, that "the evils of their superiors do so displease good subjects, that however they do conceal them from others;"§ and "Subjects are to be admonished, that they do not rashly judge the life of their superiors, if perhaps they see them do blamably," &c.‖

It is plain that St. Paul was more bold with St. Peter than any man now must be with the Pope; for let the Pope commit never so great crimes, yet no mortal, saith the canon law, presume to reprove his faults.¶

But if St. Peter were not in office superior to St. Paul, but his colleague, and equal in authority, although preceding him in standing, repute, and other advantages; then St. Paul's free

* Aug. cont. Crescon. i. 32. ii. 32. Ep. 19. de Bapt. cont. Don. ii. 1. 2. correptus, cont. Don. ii. 1. objurgavit, Ep. 8. Tert. v. 3. (contra Marc.) Fac. Her. viii. 6.

† Hier. ad Aug. Ep. 11. in Prol. ad Gal.

‡ Pelag. II. Ep. 2. § Greg. M. Moral. xxv. 15

‖ Greg. Past. part. iii. cap. i. Admon. 5.

¶ Grat. Dist. xl. cap. 6.

proceeding toward him was not only warrantable, but wholesome, and deserving for edification to be recited and recorded; as implying an example how colleagues on occasion should with freedom and sincerity admonish their brethren of their errors and faults; St. Peter's carriage in patiently bearing that correction also affording another good pattern of equanimity in such cases; to which purpose St. Cyprian* (alleged and approved by St. Austin†) doth apply this passage; "for," saith he, "neither Peter, whom the Lord first chose, and on whom he built his Church, when Paul afterward contested with him about circumcision, did insolently challenge, or arrogantly assume any thing to himself, so as to say, that he did hold the primacy, and that rather those who were newer and later Apostles ought to obey him; neither despised he St. Paul, because he was before a persecutor of the Church; but he admitted the counsel of truth, and easily consented to the lawful course which St. Paul did maintain; yielding indeed to us a document both of concord and patience, that we should not pertinaciously love our own things, but should rather take those things for ours which sometimes are profitably and wholesomely suggested by our brethren and colleagues, if they are true and lawful:" this St. Cyprian speaketh, on supposition that St. Peter and St. Paul were equals, or (as he calleth them) colleagues and brethren, in rank coordinate; otherwise St. Cyprian would not have approved the action; for he often severely doth inveigh against inferiors taking on them to censure their superiors; "What tumor," saith he, "of pride, what arrogance of mind, what inflation of heart is it, to call our superiors and bishops to our cognisance?"‡ St. Cyprian therefore could not conceive St. Peter to be St. Paul's governor, or superior in power; he doth indeed plainly enough in the forecited words signify, that in his judgment St. Peter had done insolently and arrogantly, if he had assumed any obedience from St. Paul. St. Austin also doth in several places of his writings make the like application of this passage.§

The ancient writer contemporary to St. Ambrose, and passing under his name, doth argue in this manner; "Who dared resist Peter the first Apostle, to whom the Lord did give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, but another such a one; who in assurance of his election knowing himself to be not unequal to him, might constantly disprove what he had unadvisedly done?"‖

* Cypr. Ep. 71. (ad Quint.) † De Bapt. cont. Don. ii. 2.
‡ Cypr. Ep. 69. § Cont. Don. de Bapt. ii. 1. 2. Ep. 19.
‖ Ambr. in Gal. ii. 9.

It is indeed well known that Origen, and after him St. Chrysostom and St. Jerome, and divers of the ancients beside, did conceive that St. Paul did not seriously oppose or tax St. Peter, but did only do it seemingly, on confederacy with him, for promoting a good design.*

This interpretation, however strained and earnestly impugned by St. Austin, I will not discuss; but only shall observe that it being admitted doth rather strengthen than weaken our discourse: for if St. Peter were St. Paul's governor, it maketh St. Peter to have consented to an act in all appearance indecent, irregular, and scandalous; and how can we imagine that St. Peter would have complotted to the impairing his own just authority in the eye of a great Church? doth not such a condescension imply in him a disavowing of superiority over St. Paul, or a conspiracy with him to overthrow good order?

To which purpose we may observe that St. Chrysostom,† in a large and very elaborate discourse, wherein he professeth to endeavor an aggravation of the irregularity of St. Paul's demeanor, if it were serious; doth not lay the stress of that aggravation on St. Paul's opposing his lawful governor; but his only so treating a co-apostle of such eminency: neither when to that end he designeth to reckon all the advantages of St. Peter beyond St. Paul, or any other Apostle, doth he mention this, which was chiefly material to his purpose, that he was St. Paul's governor; which observations if we do carefully weigh, we can hardly imagine that St. Chrysostom had any notion of St. Peter's supremacy in relation to the Apostles.

In fine, the drift of St. Paul, in reporting those passages concerning himself, was not to disparage the other Apostles, nor merely to commend himself, but to fence the truth of his doctrine, and maintain the liberty of his disciples against any prejudice that might arise from any authority, that might be pretended in any considerable respects superior to his, and alleged against them; to which purpose he declareth by arguments and matters of fact, that his authority was perfectly apostolical, and equal to the greatest; even to that of St. Peter, the prime Apostle; of St. John, the beloved disciple; of St. James, the bishop of Jerusalem; the judgment or practice of whom was no law to him, nor should be to them, farther than it did consist with that doctrine which he, by an independent authority, and by special revelation from Christ, did

* S. Cyril. cont. Jul. lib. ix. (p. 325.) Chrys. tom. v. Or. 59. οὐκ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς. Aug. Ep. 11. &c.

† Chrys. tom. v. Or. 59.

preach unto them: he might, as St. Chrysostom noteth, have pretended 'to some advantage over them,' in regard that he 'had labored more abundantly than they all;' but he forbeareth to do so, 'being contented to obtain equal advantages.'*

Well therefore, considering the disadvantage which this passage bringeth to the Roman pretence, might this history be called by Baronius, a history hard to be understood, a stone of offence, a rock of scandal, a rugged place, which St. Austin himself, under favor, could not pass over without stumbling.†

It may also be considered, that St. Paul particularly doth assert to himself an independent authority over the Gentiles, coordinate to that which St. Peter had over the Jews; the which might engage him so earnestly to contest with St. Peter, as by his practice seducing those who belonged to his charge; the which also probably moved him thus to assert his authority to the Galatians, as being Gentiles under his care, and thence obliged especially to regard his authority. 'They,' saith St. Paul, 'knowing that I was intrusted with the gospel of uncircumcision, as Peter was intrusted with that of circumcision,—gave unto me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship:' the which words do clearly enough signify that he took himself, and that the other Apostles took him to have, under Christ, an absolute charge, subordinate to no man, over the Gentiles; whence he claimeth to himself, as his burden, 'the care of all the churches:' he therefore might well contest for their liberty, he might well insist on his authority among them.

Thus did St. Chrysostom understand the case; for "Christ," saith he, "committed the Jews to Peter, but set Paul over the Gentiles;"‡ and, "He," saith that great Father, "farther doth show himself to be equal to them in dignity, and compareth himself, not only to the others, but even to the ringleader; showing that each did enjoy equal dignity."§

It may also by any prudent considerer easily be discerned, that if St. Peter had really been as they assert him, so in authority superior to the other Apostles, it is hardly possible that St. Paul should on these occasions express nothing of it.

16. If St. Peter had been appointed sovereign of the Church, it seemeth that it should have been requisite that he should have outlived all the Apostles; for then either the Church must have wanted a head, or there must have been an inextricable controversy about who that head was. St. Peter died

* Chrys. in Gal. i. 1.
† An. li. §. 32-34. 35. &c.
‡ Chrys. tom. v. Or. 59.
§ Chrys. in Gal. ii. 8.

long before St. John, (as all agree,) and perhaps before divers others of the Apostles. Now, after his departure, did the Church want a head? (then it might before and after have none; and our adversaries lose the main ground of their pretence.) Did one of the Apostles become head? (which of them was it; on what ground did he assume the headship, or who conferred it on him; who ever did acknowlege any such thing, or where is there any report about it?) Was any other person made head? (suppose the bishop of Rome, who only pretendeth thereto;) then did St. John and other Apostles become subject to one in degree inferior to them; then what becometh of St. Paul's 'first Apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers?' What do all the apostolical privileges come to, when St. John must be at the command of Linus, and Cletus, and Clemens, and of I know not who beside? Was it not a great absurdity for the Apostles to truckle under the 'pastors and teachers of Rome?'

The like may be said for St. James, if he (as the Roman Church doth in its Liturgics suppose) were an Apostle, who in many respects might claim the preeminence; who therefore, in the Apostolical Constitutions, is preferred before Clement bishop of Rome.

17. On the same grounds, on which a supremacy of power is claimed to St. Peter, other Apostles might also challenge a superiority therein over their brethren; but to suppose such a difference of power among the rest is absonous; and therefore the grounds are not valid on which St. Peter's supremacy is built.

I instance in St. James and St. John, who on the same probabilities had (after St. Peter) a preference to the other Apostles. For to them our Saviour declared a special regard; to them the Apostles afterwards may seem to have yielded a particular deference; they, in merit and performances, seem to have surpassed; they (after St. Peter and his brother) were first called to the apostolical office; they (as St. Peter) were by our Lord new christened, (as it were,) and nominated *Boanerges*, by a name signifying the efficacy of their endeavor in their master's service; they, together with St. Peter, were assumed to behold the transfiguration; they were culled out to wait on our Lord in his agony; they also, with St. Peter, (others being excluded,) were taken to attest our Lord's performance of that great miracle, of restoring the ruler's daughter to life; they, presuming on their special favor with our Lord, did pretend to the chief places in his kingdom.

To one of them it is expressed that our Saviour did bear a

peculiar affection, he being 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' and 'who leaned on his bosom:' to the other he particularly discovered himself after his resurrection, and first honored him with the crown of martyrdom.

They in blood and cognation did nearest touch our Lord; being his cousin germans; (which was esteemed by the ancients a ground of preferment;) as Hegesippus reporteth.*

Their industry and activity in propagation of the gospel was most eminently conspicuous.

To them it was peculiar that St. James did first suffer for it, and St. John did longest persist in the faithful confession of it; whose writings in several kinds do remain as the richest magazines of Christian doctrine, furnishing us with the fullest testimonies concerning the divinity of our Lord, with special histories of his life, and with his divinest discourses; with most lively incitements to piety and charity; with prophetical revelations concerning the state of the Church. He therefore was one of the στύλοι, chief pillars and props, of the Christian profession; one of ὑπὲρ λίαν Ἀπόστολοι, 'the superlative Apostles.'

Accordingly in the rolls of the Apostles, and in reports concerning them, their names usually are placed after St. Peter.

Hence also some of the Fathers do take them, as St. Peter was, to have been preferred by our Lord:† "Peter," saith St. Gregory Nazianzen, "and James and John, who both were indeed, and were reckoned before the others—so indeed did Christ himself prefer them;" and, "Peter, James, and John," saith Clemens Alexandrinus, "did not, as being preferred by the Lord himself, contest for honor, but did choose James the Just, bishop of Jerusalem," (or, as Ruffinus reads, bishop of the Apostles.)

Hence if by designation of Christ, by the concession of the apostolical college, by the prefulgency of his excellent worth and merit, or on any other ground, St. Peter had the πρωτεῖα, or first place; the δευτερεῖα, or next place, in the same kind, by like means, on the same grounds, seems to have belonged unto them; and if their advantage did imply difference, not in power, but in order only, (not authoritative superiority, but honorary precedence,) then can no more be allowed or concluded due to him.

18. The Fathers, both in express terms, and implicitly or by consequence, do assert the Apostles to have been equal or coordinate in power and authority.

* Hegesipp. apud Euseb. iii. 20.

† Chrys. in Matt. xvii. 1. Greg. Naz. Or. 26. Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. ii. 1.

What can be more express than that of St Cyprian; "The other Apostles were indeed that which Peter was, endowed with equal consortship of honor and power;" and again, "Although our Lord giveth to all the Apostles after his resurrection an equal power, and saith, As the Father sent me, so I send you?"*

What can be more plain than that of St. Chrysostom; "St. Paul showeth that each Apostle did enjoy equal dignity"†

How again could St. Chrysostom ‡ more clearly signify his opinion, than when comparing St. Paul to St Peter, he calleth St. Paul *ἰσότιμον αὐτῷ*, 'equal in honor to him,' adding, *πλέον γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐρῶ τέως*, 'for I will not as yet say any thing more,' as if he thought St. Paul indeed the more honorable?

How also could St. Cyril more plainly declare his sense to be the same, than when he called St. Peter and St. John *ἰσοτίμους ἀλλήλοις*, 'equal to one another in honor?'§

Did not St. Jerome also sufficiently declare his mind in the case, when he saith of the Apostles, that "the strength of the Church is equally settled on them?"‖

Doth not Dionysius (the supposed Areopagite) call "the decade of the Apostles coordinate with their foreman,"¶ St. Peter? in conformity, I suppose, to the current judgment of his age.

What can be more full than that of Isidore, (whose words show how long this sense continued in the Church;) "The other Apostles did receive an equal share of honor and power; who also being dispersed in the whole world did preach the Gospel; and to whom departing the bishops did succeed, who are constituted through the whole world in the sees of the Apostles?"**

By consequence the Fathers do assert this equality, when they affirm (as we before did show) the apostolical office to be absolutely supreme; when also they affirm (as afterwards we shall show) all the Apostles' successors to be equal as such; and particularly that the Roman bishop, on account of his succeeding St. Peter, hath no preeminence above his brethren; for, "wherever a bishop be, whether at Rome, or at Eugubium; at Constantinople, or at Rhegium; at Alexandria, or at Thanis; he is of the same worth, and of the same priesthood: the force of wealth, and lowness of poverty, doth not render a

* Cypr. de Un. Eccl. † Chrys. in Gal. ii. 8.
‡ Ibid. i. 8. § Act. Con. Eph. part. i. p. 209.
‖ Hieron. in Jovin. i. 14. ¶ Dionys. de Eccl. Hier. cap. 5.
** Isid. Hisp. de Off. ii. 5.

bishop more high or more low; for that all of them are successors of the Apostles."*

19. Neither is it to prudential esteem a despicable consideration, that the most ancient of the Fathers, having occasion sometimes largely to discourse of St. Peter, do not mention any such prerogatives belonging to him.

20. The last argument which I shall use against this primacy, shall be the insufficiency of those arguments and testimonies, which they allege to warrant and prove it.

If this point be of so great consequence as they make it; if, as they would persuade us, the subsistence, order, unity, and peace of the Church, together with the salvation of Christians, do depend on it;† if, as they suppose, many great points of truth do hang on this pin; if it be, as they declare, a main article of faith, and "not only a simple error, but a pernicious heresy to deny this primacy;"‡ then it is requisite that a clear revelation from God should be producible in favor of it, (for on that ground only such points can firmly stand;) then it is most probable that God (to prevent controversies, occasions of doubt, and excuses for error about so grand a matter) would not have failed to have declared it so plainly, as might serve to satisfy any reasonable man, and to convince any forward gainsayer: but no such revelation doth appear; for the places of Scripture which they allege do not plainly express it, nor pregnantly imply it, nor can it by fair consequence be inferred from them: no man unprepossessed with affection to their side would descry it in them; without thwarting St. Peter's order, and wresting the Scriptures, they cannot deduce it from them. This by examining their allegations will appear.

1. They allege those words of our Saviour, uttered by him on occasion of St. Peter's confessing him to be the Son of God, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church.' Here, say they, St. Peter is declared the foundation, that is, the sole supreme governor of the Church.§

To this I answer:

1. Those words do not clearly signify any thing to their purpose; for they are metaphorical, and thence ambiguous, or capable of divers interpretations; whence they cannot suffice to ground so main a point of doctrine, or to warrant so huge a

* Hier. ad Evagr. Ep. 85. Clem. ad Corinth. Iren. iii. 12. iii. 1. 3.

† Bell. præf. ad lib. de Pontif. R. ‡ Bell. de Pont. R. i. 10.

§ P. Gelas. i. Dist. 21. cap. 3.

pretence; these ought to stand on downright, evident, and indubitable testimony.

It is pretty to observe how Bellarmine proposeth this testimony; "Of which words," saith he, "the sense is plain and obvious, that it be understood, that under two metaphors the principate of the whole Church was promised;"* as if that sense could be so plain and obvious, which is couched under two metaphors, and those not very pat or clear in application to their sense.

2. This is manifestly confirmed from that the Fathers and Divines, both ancient and modern, have much differed in exposition of these words.

["Some," saith Abulensis,† "say that this rock is Peter—others say, and better, that it is Christ—others say, and yet better, that it is the confession which Peter maketh."]

For some interpret this rock to be Christ himself, of whom St. Paul saith, 'Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'

St. Austin telleth us in his Retractations, that he often had expounded the words to this purpose, although he did not absolutely reject that interpretation which made St. Peter the rock; leaving it to the reader's choice which is the most probable.‡

Others (and those most eminent Fathers) do take the rock to be St. Peter's faith, or profession; "On the rock," saith the prince of interpreters, "that is, on the faith of his profession;"§ and again, "Christ said that he would build his church on Peter's confession;"|| and again, (he, or another ancient writer under his name,) "On this rock, he said not on Peter; for he did not build his Church on the man, but on his faith."¶

"Our Lord," saith Theodoret, "did permit the first of the Apostles, whose confession he did fix as a prop or foundation of the Church, to be shaken."**

[Whence Origen saith that "every disciple of Christ is the rock,"†† in virtue of his agreement with Peter in that holy confession.]

This sense even Popes have embraced.‡‡

* Bell. de Pont. i. 10. † Tostat. in Matth. xvi. qu. 67.

‡ Aug. Retr. i. 21. Vide Aug. in Joh. tr. 124 de verb. Dom. in Matt. Serm. 13. Aug. in Joh. tr. 124. et de verb. Dom. in Matt. Serm. 13. (tom. 10.) Ans. in Matt. xvi. 18.

§ Chrys. in Matt. xvi. 18. || Ibid. in Joh. i. 50.

¶ Ibid. tom. v. Or. 163. Hil. de Trin. 6.

** Theod. Ep. 77. †† Orig. in Matt. xvi. p. 275.

‡‡ Greg. M. Ep. iii. 33. Felix III. Ep. 5.

Others say that as St. Peter did not speak for himself, but in the name of all the Apostles,* and of all faithful people, representing the pastors and people of the Church; so correspondently our Lord did declare that he would build his Church on such faithful pastors and confessors.

Others do indeed by the rock understand St. Peter's person, but do not thereby expound to be meant his being supreme governor of the Apostles, or of the whole church.†

The divines, schoolmen, and canonists of the Roman communion, do not also agree in exposition of the words; and divers of the most learned among them do approve the interpretation of St. Chrysostom.

Now then, how can so great a point of doctrine be firmly grounded on a place of so doubtful interpretation? How can any one be obliged to understand the words according to their interpretation, which persons of so good sense and so great authority do understand otherwise? With what modesty can they pretend that meaning to be clear, which so perspicacious eyes could not discern therein? Why may not I excusably agree with St. Chrysostom, or St. Austin, in understanding the place? May I not reasonably oppose their judgment to the opinion of any modern doctors, deeming Bellarmine as fallible in his conceptions, as one of them? Why consequently may I not without blame refuse their doctrine, as built on this place, or disavow the goodness of this proof?

3. It is very evident that the Apostles themselves did not understand those words of our Lord to signify any grant or promise to St. Peter of supremacy over them; for would they have contended for the chief place, if they had understood whose it of right was by our Lord's own positive determination? would they have disputed about a question, which to their knowlege by their Master was already stated? would they have troubled our Lord to inquire of him who should be the greatest in his kingdom, when they knew that our Lord had declared his will to make St. Peter viceroy? would the sons of Zebedee have been so foolish and presumptuous, as to beg the place, which they knew by our Lord's word and promise fixed on St. Peter? would St. Peter, among the rest, have fretted at that idle overture, whenas he knew the place by our Lord's immutable purpose and infallible declaration assured to him? And if none of the Apostles did understand the words to imply this Roman sense, who can be obliged so to understand them?

* Cypr. Ep. 55. Aug. Ep. 165. Hier. in loc.
† Vide Rigalt. in Cypr. Ep. 27. 40. 70. 71. 73. 69.

yea who can wisely, who can safely so understand them? for surely they had common sense, as well as any man living now; they had as much advantage as we can have to know our Lord's meaning; their ignorance therefore of this sense being so apparent, is not only a just excuse for not admitting this interpretation, but a strong bar against it.

4. This interpretation also doth not well consist with our Lord's answers to the contests, inquiries, and petitions of his disciples, concerning the point of superiority: for doth he not (if the Roman expositions be good) seem on those occasions, not only to dissemble his own word and promise, but to disavow them, or thwart them? can we conceive that he would in such a case of doubt forbear to resolve them, clearly to instruct them, and admonish them of their duty?

5. Taking the rock, as they would have it, to be the person of St. Peter, and that on him the Church should be built; yet do not the words 'being a rock' probably denote government? for what resemblance is there between being a rock and a governor? at least what assurance can there be, that this metaphor precisely doth import that sense; seeing in other respects, on as fair similitudes, he might be called so?

St. Austin saith, "the Apostles were foundations, because their authority doth support our weakness."*

St. Jerome saith that they "were foundations, because the faith of the Church was first laid in them."†

St. Basil saith that "St. Peter's soul was called the rock, because it was firmly rooted in the faith, and did hold stiff, without giving way against the blows of temptation."‡

Chrysologus saith that "Peter had his name from a rock, because he first merited to found the Church by firmness of faith."§

These are fair explications of the metaphor, without any reference to St. Peter's government.

But however also admitting this, that being such a rock doth imply government and pastoral charge; yet do they (notwithstanding these grants and suppositions) effect nothing; for they cannot prove the words spoken exclusively in regard to other Apostles, or to import any thing singular to him above or beside them: he might be a governing rock, so might others be; the Church might be built on him, so it might be on other Apostles; he might be designed a governor, a great governor,

* Aug. in Ps. lxxxvi.
† Hier. in Ps. lxxxvi.
‡ Bas. in Is. ii. p. 869.
§ Chrys. Serm. 53.

a principal governor, so might they also be; this might be without any violence done to those words.

And this indeed was; for all the other Apostles in holy Scripture are called foundations, and the Church is said to be built on them.

"If," saith Origen, the Father of interpreters, "you think the whole Church to be only built on Peter alone, what will you say of John the son of thunder, and of each of the Apostles?"* &c. largely to this purpose.

"Christ," as St. Jerome saith, "was the Rock, and he bestowed it on the Apostles, that they should be called rocks."† And, "You say," saith he again, "that the Church is founded on Peter; but the same in another place is done on all the Apostles."‡

The twelve Apostles, saith another ancient author, "were the immutable pillars of orthodoxy, the rock of the Church."

"The Church," saith St. Basil, "is built on the foundation of the prophets and Apostles; Peter also was one of the mountains; on which rock the Lord did promise to build his Church."§

St. Cyprian,‖ in his disputes with Pope Stephen, did more than once allege this place, yet could he not take them in their sense to signify exclusively; for he did not acknowlege any imparity of power among the Apostles or their successors. He indeed plainly took these words to respect all the Apostles and their successors; our Lord taking occasion to promise that to one, which he intended to impart to all for themselves and their successors; "Our Lord," saith he, "ordering the honor of a bishop, and the order of his Church, saith to Peter, I say to thee, &c. Hence through the turns of times and successions, the ordination of bishops, and the manner of the Church doth run on, that the Church should be settled on the bishops, and every act of the Church should be governed by the same prelates:"¶ as therefore he did conceive the Church to be built, not on the Pope singularly, but on all the bishops; so he thought our Lord did intend to build his Church, not on St. Peter only, but on all his Apostles.

6. It is not said that the Apostles, or the apostolical office, should be built on him; for that could not be, seeing the Apostles were constituted, and the apostolical office was

* Orig. in Matth. xvi. p. 275. † Hier. in Amos ix. 12.
‡ Hier. in Jovin. i. 14. § Basil. in Isa. ii. p. 869.
‖ Ep. 71. 73. ¶ Cypr. Ep. 27. et de Unit. Eccl.

founded, before that promise; the words only therefore can import that according to some meaning he was a rock, on which the Church, afterward to be collected, should be built; he was "a rock of the Church to be built," as Tertullian speaketh:* the words therefore cannot signify any thing available to their purpose, in relation to the Apostles.

7. If we take St. Peter himself for the rock, then (as I take it) the best meaning of the words doth import that our Lord designed St. Peter for a prime instrument, (the first mover, the most diligent and active at the beginning, the most constant, stiff, and firm,) in the support of his truth, and propagation of his doctrine, or conversion of men to the belief of the gospel; the which is called building of the Church; according to that of St. Ambrose, or some ancient Homilist under his name, "He is called a rock, because he first did lay in the nations the foundations of faith:"† in which regard, as the other Apostles are called foundations of the Church, (the Church being founded on their labors,) so might St. Peter signally be so called; who, as St. Basil saith, allusively interpreting our Saviour's words, "for the excellency of his faith did take on him the edifying of the Church."‡

Both he and they also might be so termed, for that on their testimonies concerning the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, the faith of Christians was grounded; as also it stands on their convincing discourses, their holy practice, their miraculous performances; in all which St. Peter was most eminent; and in the beginning of Christianity displayed them to the edification of the Church.

This interpretation plainly doth agree with matter of fact and history; which is the best interpreter of right or privilege in such cases; for we may reasonably understand our Saviour to have promised that, which in effect we see performed; so "the event showeth, the Church was built on him, that is by him," saith Tertullian.§

But this sense doth not imply any superiority of power or dignity granted to St. Peter above his brethren; however it may signify an advantage belonging to him, and deserving especial respect; as St. Chrysostom notably doth set out in these words; "Although John, although James, although Paul, although any other whoever may appear performing great matters; he yet doth surpass them all, who did precede them in

* Tertull. de Præscr. cap. 22. † Ambr. de Sanctis. Serm. 2.
‡ Bas. contra Eunom. lib. 2. Tertull. de Præscr. cap. 22.
§ Tert. de Pudic. cap. 21.

liberty of speech, and opened the entrance, and gave to them, as to a river carried with a huge stream, to enter with great ease :"* doing this, as, I say, it might signify his being a rock of the Church, so it denoteth an excellency of merit, but not a superiority in power.

8. It may also be observed that St. Peter, before the speaking of those words by our Lord may seem to have had a primacy, intimated by the Evangelists, when they report his call to the apostolical office; and by his behavior, when in this confession, and before in the like, he undertook to be their mouth and spokesman; when, "not being unmindful of his place," saith St. Ambrose, "he did act a primacy; a primacy," addeth that Father, "of confession, not of honor; of faith, not of order :"† his primacy therefore (such as he had) cannot well be founded on this one place, he being afore possessed of it, and, as St. Ambrose conceived, exercising it at that time.

II. They allege the next words of our Lord, spoken in sequel on the same occasion, 'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven;' that is, say they, "the supreme power over all the Church;" ‡ for he, say they, that hath the keys is master of the house.

To this testimony we may apply divers of the same answers, which were given to the former; for,

1. These words are figurate, and therefore not clear enough to prove their assertion.

2. They do admit, and have received, various interpretations.

3. It is evident that the Apostles themselves did not understand these words as importing a supremacy over them; that St. Peter himself did not apprehend this sense; that our Lord, on occasion inviting to it, did not take notice of his promise according thereto.

4. The words, 'I will give thee,' cannot anywise be assured to have been exclusive of others, or appropriated to him. "He said," (as a very learned man of the Roman communion noteth) "to Peter, I will give thee the keys; but he said not, I will give them to thee alone;"§ nothing therefore can be concluded from them to their purpose.

5. The Fathers do affirm that all the Apostles did receive the same keys.

"Are," saith Origen, "the keys of the kingdom of heaven given by the Lord to Peter alone, and shall none other of the blessed ones receive them? But if this, I will give thee the

* Chrys. tom. v. Or. 59.
† Ambr. de Incarn. cap. 4.
‡ Bell. de Pont. i. 3.
§ Rigalt. in Epist. Firmil.

keys of the kingdom of heaven, be common, how also are not all the things common, which were spoken before, or are added as spoken to Peter?"*

St. Jerome says in express words, that all "the Apostles did receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven."†

"He," saith Optatus, "did alone receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, (which were) to be communicated to the rest;" that is, (as Rigaltius well expoundeth those words,) "which Christ himself would also communicate to the rest."‡

Theophylact. "Although it be spoken to Peter alone, I will give thee, yet it is given to all the Apostles."§

It is part of St. John's character in St. Chrysostom, "He that hath the keys of the heavens.' ||

6. Indeed, whatever (according to any tolerable exposition, or according to the current expositions of the Fathers) those keys of the kingdom of heaven do import,¶ (whether it be a faculty of opening it by doctrine, of admitting into it by dispensation of baptism and absolution, of excluding from it by ecclesiastical censure, or any such faculty signified by that metaphorical expression,) it plainly did belong to all the Apostles, and was effectually conferred on them; yea, after them, on all the pastors of the Church in their several precincts and degrees; who in all ages have claimed to themselves the power of the keys; to be (as the Council of Compeigne calleth all bishops) *clavigeri*, "the key-bearers of the kingdom of heaven."**

So that in these words nothing singular was promised or granted to St. Peter; although it well may be deemed a singular mark of favor, that what our Lord did intend to bestow on all pastors, that he did anticipately promise to him; or, as the Fathers say, to the Church and its pastors in him. In which respect we may admit those words of Pope Leo I.††

7. Indeed divers of the Fathers do conceive the words spoken to St. Peter, not as a single person, but as a representative of the Church, or as standing in the room of each pastor therein; unto whom our Lord designed to impart the power of the keys.

* Orig. in Matt. xvi. p. 275.
† Ambr. in Psal. xxxviii. Hier. in Jov. i. 14.
‡ Opt. lib. 7. Rigalt. in Cypr. de Un. Eccl.
§ Theoph. in loc. || Chrys. in Præf. Evang. Joh.
¶ Rigalt. in Cyp. Ep. 73.
** Conc. Comp. apud Bin. tom. vi. p. 361.
†† Leo I. in Nat. Petri et Pauli. Serm. 2.

"All we bishops," saith St. Ambrose, "have in St. Peter received the keys of the kingdom of heaven."*

8. These answers are confirmed by the words immediately adjoined, equivalent to these, and interpretative of them; 'And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven;' —the which do import a power or privilege soon after expressly, and in the very same words, promised or granted to all the Apostles; as also the same power in other words was by our Lord conferred on them all after the resurrection.

If therefore the keys of the kingdom of heaven do import supreme power, then each Apostle had supreme power.

9. If we should grant (that which nowise can be proved) that something peculiarly belonging to St. Peter is implied in those words, it can only be this, that he should be a prime man in the work of preaching and propagating the gospel, and conveying the heavenly benefits of it to believers; which is an opening of the kingdom of heaven; according to what Tertullian excellently saith of him: "So," saith he, "the event teacheth, the Church was built in him, that is, by him; he did initiate the key; see which, Ye men of Israel, hear these words, Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, &c. He, in fine, in the baptism of Christ, did unlock the entrance to the kingdom of heaven," &c.†

10. It seemeth absurd that St. Peter should exercise the power of the keys in respect to the Apostles: for did he open the kingdom of heaven to them, who were by our Lord long before admitted into it?

11. In fine, our Lord (as St. Luke relateth it) did say to St. Peter, and probably to him first, 'Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men:' might it hence be inferred that St. Peter had a peculiar or sole faculty of catching men? why might it not by as good a consequence as this, whereby they would appropriate to him this opening faculty? Many such instances might in like manner be used.

III. They produce those words of our Saviour to St. Peter, 'Feed my sheep;' that is, in the Roman interpretation, 'Be thou universal governor of my Church.'

To this allegation I answer:

1. From words which truly and properly might have been said to any other Apostle, yea, to any Christian pastor what-

* Ambr. de Dign. Sac. 1. Aug. tract. 124. in Joh. Vid. tract. 50. De Bap. iii. 17. Phot. Cod. 280. Aug. de Ag. Chr. cap. xxx. in Ps. cviii.

† Tert. de Pud. 21.

ever, nothing can be concluded to their purpose, importing a peculiar duty or singular privilege of St. Peter.

2. From indefinite words a definite conclusion (especially in matters of this kind) may not be inferred: it is said, 'Do thou feed my sheep;' it is not said, Do thou alone feed all my sheep: this is their arbitrary gloss, or presumptuous improvement of the text; without succor whereof the words signify nothing to their purpose, so far are they from sufficiently assuring so vast a pretence: for instance, when St. Paul doth exhort the bishops at Ephesus 'to feed the Church of God;' may it thence be collected that each of them was an universal governor of the whole Church, 'which Christ had purchased with his own blood?'

3. By these words no new power is (assuredly at least) granted or instituted by our Lord;* for the Apostles before this had their warrant and authority consigned to them, when our Lord did inspire them, and solemnly commissionate them, saying, 'As the Father did send me, so I send you:' to which commission, these words (spoken occasionally, before a few of the disciples) did not add or derogate. At most the words do only, as St. Cyril saith, "renew the former grant of Apostleship," after his great offence of denying our Lord.†

4. These words do not seem institutive or collative of power, but rather only admonitive or exhortative to duty; implying no more, but the pressing a common duty, before incumbent on St. Peter, on a special occasion, in an advantageous season, that he should effectually discharge the office which our Lord had committed to him.

Our Lord, I say, presently before his departure, when his words were like to have a strong impression on St. Peter, doth earnestly direct and warn him to express that special ardency of affection, which he observed in him, in an answerable care to perform his duty of feeding; that is, of instructing, guiding, edifying, in faith and obedience, those sheep of his; that is, those believers who should be converted to embrace his religion, as ever he should find opportunity.‡

5. The same office certainly did belong to all the Apostles, who, as St. Jerome speaketh, "were the princes of our discipline, and chieftains of the Christain doctrine;"§ they at their first vocation had a commission and command 'to go unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel, that were scattered abroad like sheep not having a shepherd;' they before our Lord's

* Cyril. in loc. † Ibid. ‡ Aug. in Joh. tr. 47.
§ Hier. in Jovin. i. 14.

ascension were enjoined 'to teach all nations' the doctrines and precepts of Christ; to receive them into the fold, to feed them with good instruction, to guide and govern their converts with good discipline; hence, "All of them," as St. Cyprian saith, "were shepherds; but the flock did appear one, which was fed by the Apostles with unanimous agreement."*

6. Neither could St. Peter's charge be more extensive than was that of the other Apostles; for they had a general and unlimited care of the whole Church; that is, according to their capacity and opportunity, none being exempted from it who needed or came into the way of their discharging pastoral offices for them.

"They were œcumenical rulers," as St. Chrysostom saith, "appointed by God, who did not receive several nations or cities, but all of them in common were intrusted with the world."†

Hence particularly St. Chrysostom calleth St. John, "a pillar of the churches over the world;" and St. Paul, "an Apostle of the world;" who "had the care, not of the house, but of cities and nations, and of the whole earth;" who "undertook the world, and governed the churches;" on whom "the whole world did look," and "on whose soul the care of all the churches everywhere did hang; into whose hands were delivered the earth, and the sea, the inhabited and uninhabited parts of the world."‡

And could St. Peter have a larger flock committed to him? could this charge, 'Feed my sheep,' more agree to him than to those, who no less than he were obliged to feed all Christian people everywhere?

7. The words indeed are applicable to all Christian bishops and governors of the Church; according to that of St. Cyprian to Pope Stephen himself; "We being many shepherds do feed one flock, and all the sheep of Christ:"§ for they are styled pastors; they, in terms as indefinite as those in this text, are exhorted 'to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood;' to them (as the Fathers commonly suppose) this injunction doth reach, our Lord, when he spake thus to St. Peter, intending to lay a charge on them all to express their love and piety toward him in this way, by feeding his sheep and people.‖

* Cypr. de Un. Eccl. † Chrys. tom. viii. p. 115.

‡ Chrys. Præf. Comment. ad Joh. in 1 Cor. ix. 2. in 2 Cor. xi. 28.

§ Cypr. Ep. 67. ad P. Steph. ‖ Aug. in Joh. tract. 123.

"Which sheep," saith St. Ambrose, "and which flock, not only then St. Peter did receive, but also with him all we priests did receive it."*

"Our Lord," saith St. Chrysostom, "did commit his sheep to Peter, and to those which came after him:"† that is, to all Christian pastors, as the scope of his discourse showeth.

"When it is said to Peter," saith St. Austin, "it is said to all, Feed my sheep."‡

"And we," saith St. Basil, "are taught this (obedience to superiors) by Christ himself constituting St. Peter pastor after himself of the Church, (for, Peter, saith he, dost thou love me more than these? Feed my sheep;) and conferring to all pastors and teachers continually afterward an equal power (of doing so;) whereof it is a sign that all do in like manner bind and do loose as he."§

St. Austin compriseth all these considerations in those words.||

How could these great masters more clearly express their mind, that our Lord in those words to St. Peter did inculcate a duty nowise peculiar to him, but equally together with him belonging to all guides of the Church; in such manner, as when a master doth press a duty on one servant, he doth thereby admonish all his servants of the like duty? whence St. Austin saith that St. Peter in that case "did sustain the person of the Church;"¶ that which was spoken to him belonging to all its members, especially to his brethren the clergy.

"It was," saith Cyril, "a lesson to teachers, that they cannot otherwise please the arch-pastor of all, than by taking care of the welfare of the rational sheep."**

8. Hence it followeth that the sheep which our Saviour biddeth St. Peter to feed, were not the Apostles, who were his fellow-shepherds, designed to feed others, and needing not to be fed by him; but the common believers or people of God, which St. Peter himself doth call 'the flock of God;' 'Feed,' saith he to his fellow-elders, 'the flock of God, which is among you:' and St. Paul, 'Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.'

* Ambr. de Sacerd. 2. † Chrys. de Sacerd. 1.
‡ Aug. de Agone Christ. 30. § Bas. Const. Mon. cap. 22.
|| Aug. in Joh. tract. 47.
¶ In Ps. cviii. Chrys. in Matt. xxiv. Or. 77.
** Cyril. ibid.

9. Take feeding for what you please; for teaching; for guiding; the Apostles were not fit objects of it, who were immediately taught and guided by God himself.

Hence we may interpret that saying of St. Chrysostom, which is the most plausible argument they can allege for them, that our Lord, in saying this, did commit to St. Peter "a charge (or presidency) over his brethren;"* that is, he made him a pastor of Christian people, as he did others; at least, if προστασία τῶν ἀδελφῶν be referred to the Apostles, it must not signify authority over them, but at most a primacy of order among them; for that St. Peter otherwise should feed them, St. Chrysostom could hardly think, who presently after saith that "seeing the Apostles were to receive the administration of the whole world, they ought not afterward to converse with one onother; for that would surely have been a great damage to the world."†

10. But they, forsooth, must have St. Peter solely obliged to feed all Christ's sheep; so they did impose on him a vast and crabbed province; a task very incommodious, or rather impossible for him to undergo. How could he in duty be obliged, how could he in effect be able, to feed so many flocks of Christian people scattered about in distant regions, through all nations under heaven? He, poor man, that had so few helps, that had no officers or dependents, nor wealth to maintain them, would have been much put to it to feed the sheep in Britain and in Parthia; unto infinite distraction of thoughts such a charge must needs have engaged him.

But for this their great champion hath a fine expedient; "St. Peter," saith he, "did feed Christ's whole flock, partly by himself, partly by others;"‡ so that, it seemeth, the other Apostles were St. Peter's curates, or vicars and deputies. This indeed were an easy way of feeding; thus, although he had slept all his time, he might have fed all the sheep under heaven; thus any man as well might have fed them. But this manner of feeding is, I fear, a later invention, not known so soon in the Church; and it might then seem near as absurd to be a shepherd, as it is now (in his own account) to be a just man by imputation; that would be a kind of putative pastorage, as this a putative righteousness. However, the Apostles, I dare say, did not take themselves to be St. Peter's surrogates, but challenged to themselves to be accounted 'the ministers,' 'the stewards,' 'the ambassadors of Christ himself;' from whom im-

* Chrys. in Job. xxi. 15. In ver. 21. † Ibid. ver. 23.
‡ Bell. de Pont. R. i. 16.

mediately they received their orders, in whose name they acted, to whom they constantly refer their authority, without taking the least notice of St. Peter, or intimating any dependence on him.

It was therefore enough for St. Peter that he had authority restrained to no place; but might, as he found occasion, preach the gospel, convert, confirm, guide Christians everywhere to truth and duty: nor can our Saviour's words be forced to signify more.

In fine, this (together with the precedent testimonies) must not be interpreted so as to thwart practice and history; according to which it appeareth that St. Peter did not exercise such a power, and therefore our Lord did not intend to confer such an one on him.

IV. Farther in confirmation of their doctrine, they do draw forth a whole shoal of testimonies, containing divers prerogatives, as they call them, of St. Peter, which do, as they suppose, imply this primacy; so very sharp-sighted indeed they are, that in every remarkable accident befalling him, in every action performed by him, or to him, or about him, they can descry some argument or shrewd insinuation of his preeminence; especially being aided by the glosses of some fanciful expositor. From the change of his name; from his walking on the sea; from his miraculous draught of fish; from our Lord's praying for him that his faith should not fail, and bidding him to confirm his brethren; from our Lord's ordering him to pay the tribute for them both; from our Lord's first washing his feet, and his first appearing to him after his resurrection; from the prediction of his martyrdom; from sick persons being cured by his shadow; from his sentencing Ananias and Sapphira to death; from his preaching to Cornelius: from its being said 'that he passed through all;' from his being prayed for by the Church; from St. Paul's going to visit him; from these passages, I say, they deduce or confirm his authority. Now in earnest, is not this stout arguing? Is it not egregious modesty for such a point to allege such proofs? What cause may not be countenanced by such rare fetches? Who would not suspect the weakness of that opinion, which is fain to use such forces in its maintenance? In fine, is it honest or conscionable dealing so to wrest or play with the holy Scripture, pretending to derive thence proofs, where there is no show of consequence?

To be even with them, I might assert the primacy of St. John, and to that purpose might allege his prerogatives, (which indeed may seem greater than those of St. Peter;) namely,

that he was the beloved disciple, that he leaned on our Lord's breast; that St. Peter, not presuming to ask our Lord a question, desired him to do it, as having a more special confidence with our Lord; that St. John did higher service to the Church, and all posterity, by writing not only more epistles, but also a most divine gospel, and a sublime prophecy concerning the state of the church; that St. John did 'outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre,' (in which passage such acute devisers would find out marvellous significancy;) that St. John was a virgin; that he did outlive all the Apostles, (and thence was most fit to be universal pastor;) that St. Jerome, comparing Peter and John, doth seem to prefer the latter; for "Peter," saith he, "was an Apostle, and John was an Apostle; but Peter was only an Apostle; John both an Apostle and an Evangelist, and also a prophet; and," saith he, "that I may in brief speech comprehend many things, and show what privilege belongeth to John—yea virginity in John; by our Lord a virgin, his mother the virgin, is commended to the virgin disciple."* Thus I might by prerogatives and passages very notable infer the superiority of St. John to St. Peter, in imitation of their reasoning; but I am afraid they would scarce be at the trouble to answer me seriously, but would think it enough to say I trifled: wherefore let it suffice for me in the same manner to put off those levities of discourse.

V. They argue this primacy from the constant placing St. Peter's name before the other Apostles, in the catalogues and narrations concerning him and them.

To this I answer:

1. That this order is not so strictly observed, as not to admit some exceptions; for St. Paul saith, that 'James, Cephas, and John, knowing the grace given unto him;' so it is commonly read in the ordinary copies, in the text of ancient commentators, and in old translations; and, 'Whether Paul, whether Apollas, whether Cephas,' saith St. Paul again; and, 'As the other Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas;' and 'Philip,' saith St. John, 'was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter;' and Clemens Alexandrinus in Eusebius saith, that "the Lord, after his resurrection, delivered the special knowlege to James the Just, and to John, and to Peter;"† postponing St. Peter, as perhaps conceiving him to have less of sublime revelations imparted to him: that order therefore is not so punctually constant.

In the Apostolical Constitutions, St. Paul and St. Peter being

* Hier. in Jovin. i. 14. † Euseb. Hist. ii. 1.

induced jointly prescribing orders, they begin, 'I Paul, and I Peter, do appoint:' so little ambitious or curious of precedence are they represented.

2. But it being indeed so constant, as not to seem casual, I farther say, that position of names doth not argue difference of degree, or superiority in power; any small advantage of age, standing, merit, or wealth, serving to ground such precedence, as common experience doth show.

3. We formerly did assign other sufficient and probable causes, why St. Peter had this place. So that this is no cogent reason.

VI. Farther, (and this indeed is far their most plausible argumentation,) they allege the titles and elogies given to St. Peter by the Fathers; who call him ἔξαρχον, (the prince,) κορυφαῖον, (the ringleader,) κεφαλὴν, (the head,) πρόεδρον,* (the president,) ἀρχηγὸν, (the captain,) προήγορον, (the prolocutor,) πρωτοστάτην, (the foreman,) προστάτην, (the warden,) ἔκκριτον τῶν Ἀποστόλων, (the choice, or egregious Apostle,) *majorem*, (the greater, or grandee among them,) *primum*, (the first, or prime Apostle.)

To these and the like allegations, I answer:

1. If we should say that we are not accountable for every hyperbolical flash or flourish occurring in the Fathers, (it being well known that they in their encomiastic speeches, as orators are wont, following the heat and gaiety of fancy, do sometimes overlash,) we should have the pattern of their greatest controvertists to warrant us; for Bellarmine doth put off their testimonies by saying that they do "sometimes speak in way of excess, less properly, less warily, so as to need benign exposition," &c. as Bishop Andrews showeth; and it is a common shift of Cardinal Perron, whereof you may see divers instances alleged by M. Daillé.†

Which observation is especially applicable to this case; for that eloquent men do never more exceed in their indulgence to fancy, than in the demonstrative kind, in panegyrics, in their commendations of persons; and I hope they will embrace this way of reckoning for those expressions of Pope Leo, sounding so exorbitantly, that St. Peter was by our Lord "assumed into consortship of his individual unity;" and that "nothing did pass on any from God, the fountain of good things, without the participation of Peter."‡

2. We may observe that such turgid elogies of St. Peter are

* Chrys. tom. v. Or. 59. in Joh. xxi. Cyr. cont. Jul. ix. p. 325. Aug. Ep. xi. 19.

† Tort. Tort. p. 338. Daill. de us. P. lib. i. cap. 6. p. 158. et p. 314.

‡ P. Leo I. Ep. 89. de Assumpt. sua. Serm. 3.

not found in the more ancient Fathers; for Clemens Romanus, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Firmilian—when they mention St. Peter, do speak more temperately and simply, according to the current notions and traditions of the Church in their time; using indeed fair terms of respect, but not such high strains of courtship about him. But they are found in the latter Fathers, who being men of wit and eloquence, and affecting in their discourses to vent those faculties, did speak more out of their own invention and fancy.

Whence, according to a prudent estimation of things in such a case, the silence or sparingness of the first sort is of more consideration on the one hand, than the speech, how free soever, of the latter is on the other hand: and we may rather suppose those titles do not belong to St. Peter, because the first do not give them, than that they do, because the other are so liberal in doing it.

Indeed if we consult the testimonies of this kind alleged by the Romanists, who with their utmost diligence have raked all ancient writings for them, it is strange that they cannot find any very ancient ones; that they can find so few plausible ones; that they are fain (to make up the number) to produce so many, which evidently have no force or pertinency; being only commendations of his apostolical office, or of his personal merits, without relation to others.

3. We say that all those terms or titles, which they urge, are ambiguous, and applicable to any sort of primacy or preeminency; to that which we admit, no less than to that which we refuse; as by instances from good authors, and from common use, might easily be demonstrated; so that from them nothing can be inferred advantageous to their cause.

Cicero calleth Socrates, prince of the philosophers; and Sulpitius, prince of all lawyers: would it not be ridiculous thence to infer that Socrates was a sovereign governor of the philosophers, or Sulpitius of the lawyers? The same great speaker calleth Pompey prince of the city in all men's judgment:* doth he mean that he did exercise jurisdiction over the city?

Tertullus calleth St. Paul, πρωτοστάτην, 'a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes;' and St. Basil calleth Eustathius Sebastenus, foreman of the sect of the Pneumatomachi:† did Tertullus mean that St. Paul had universal jurisdiction over Christians? or St. Basil, that Eustathius was sovereign of those heretics?

So neither did 'prince of the Apostles,' or any equivalent

* Cic. pro domo sua. † Bas. Ep. 74.

term, in the sense of those who assigned it to St. Peter, import authority over the Apostles, but eminency among them in worth, in merit, in apostolical performances, or at most in order of precedence.

Such words are to be interpreted by the state of things, not the state of things to be inferred from them; and in understanding them we should observe the rule of Tertullian.*

4. Accordingly the Fathers sometimes do explain those elogies signifying them to import the special gifts and virtues of St. Peter, wherein he did excel; so Eusebius calleth St. Peter "the most excellent and great Apostle, who for his virtue was prolocutor of the rest."†

5. This answer is thoroughly confirmed from hence; that even those who give those titles to St. Peter, do yet expressly affirm other Apostles in power and dignity equal to him.

Who doth give higher elogies to him than St. Chrysostom? yet doth he assert all the Apostles to be supreme, and equal in dignity; and particularly he doth often affirm St. Paul to be ἰσότιμον, equal in honor to St. Peter, as we before showed.

The like we declared of St. Jerome, St. Cyril, &c. And as for St. Cyprian, who did allow a primacy to St. Peter, nothing can be more evident than that he took the other Apostles to be equal to him in power and honor.

The like we may conceive of St. Austin, who having carefully perused those writings of St. Cyprian, and frequently alleging them, doth never contradict that his sentiment.

Even Pope Gregory himself acknowlegeth St. Peter not to have been properly the head, but only "the first member of the universal Church; all being members of the Church under one head."‡

6. If Pope Leo I. or any other ancient pope, do seem to mean farther, we may reasonably except against their opinion, as being singular, and proceeding from partial affection to their see; such affection having influence on the mind of the wisest men; according to that certain maxim of Aristotle, "Every man is a bad judge in his own case."

7. The ancients, when their subject doth allure them, do adorn other Apostles with the like titles, equalling those of St. Peter, and not well consistent with them, according to that rigor of sense which our adversaries affix to the commendations of St. Peter.

The Epistle of Clemens Romanus to St. James, (an apocry-

* Tert. adv. Prax. cap. 3. † Hist. ii. 14.
‡ Greg. I. Ep. iv. 38.

phal but ancient writing,) calleth St. James our Lord's brother, the bishop of bishops;* the Clementine Recognitions call him the prince of bishops; Ruffinus, in his translation of Eusebius, the bishop of the Apostles; St. Chrysostom saith of him, that he did preside over all the Jewish believers;† Hesychius, presbyter of Jerusalem, calleth him the chief captain of the new Jerusalem, the captain of priests, the prince of the Apostles, top among the heads,‡ &c.

The same Hesychius calleth St. Andrew, the first-born of the apostolical choir, the first settled pillar of the Church, the Peter before Peter, the foundation of the foundation, the first-fruits of the beginning,§ &c.

St. Chrysostom saith of St. John, that he was "a pillar of the churches through the world, he that had the keys of the kingdom of heaven,"‖ &c.

But as occasion of speaking about St. Paul was more frequent, so the elogies of him are more copious, and indeed so high as not to yield to those of St. Peter.

"He was," saith St. Chrysostom, "the ringleader and guardian of the choir of all the saints."¶

"He was the tongue, the teacher, the Apostle of the world. He had the whole world put into his hands, and took care thereof, and had committed to him all men dwelling on earth."

"He was the light of the churches, the foundation of faith, the pillar and ground of truth."

"He had the patronage of the world committed into his hands."**

"He was better than all men, greater than the Apostles, and surpassing them all."††

"Nothing was more bright, nothing more illustrious than he."‡‡

"None was greater than he, yea none equal to him."§§

Pope Gregory I. saith of St. Paul, that he "was made head of the nations, because he obtained the principate of the whole Church."‖‖‖

* Clem. Rec. i. 68. Ruf. Euseb. ii. 1.
† Chrys. tom. v. Or. 59.
‡ Hesych. Presb. apud Phot. Cod. 275. p. 1525.
§ Hesych. apud Phot. Cod. 269. ‖ Chrys. in Joh. i. 1.
¶ Chrys. in Rom. xvi. 24. In 1 Cor. ix. 2.
** In Jud. Or. 6. In 1 Cor. Or. 22.
†† De Sacerd. 4. tom. v. Or. 33. ‡‡ Tom. v. Or. 47.
§§ Tom. vi. Or. 9. Theod. Ep. 146. Just. M. Resp. ad Orthod. Qu. 119. ‖‖‖ Greg. M. in 1 Reg. lib. 4.

These characters of St. Paul I leave them to interpret, and reconcile with those of St. Peter.

8. That the Fathers, by calling St. Peter prince, chieftain, &c. of the Apostles, do not mean authority over them, may be argued from their joining St. Paul with him in the same appellations; who yet surely could have no jurisdiction over them; and his having any would destroy the pretended ecclesiastical monarchy.

St. Cyril calleth them together, "Patrons, or Presidents of the Church."*

St. Austin (or St. Ambrose or Maximus) calleth them Princes of the churches.†

The Popes Agatho and Adrian (in their general synods) call them the ringleading Apostles.‡

The popes Nicholas I. and Gregory VII. &c. call them Princes of the Apostles.§

St. Ambrose, or St. Austin, or St. Maximus Taur. (choose you which,) doth thus speak of them; "Blessed Peter and Paul are most eminent among all the Apostles, excelling the rest by a kind of peculiar prerogative: but whether of these two be preferred before the other is uncertain; for I count them to be equal in merit, because they are equal in suffering,"|| &c.

To all this discourse I shall only add, that if any of the Apostles, or apostolical men, might claim a presidency or authoritative headship over the rest, St. James seemeth to have the best title thereto; for 'Jerusalem was the mother of all churches,'¶ the fountain of the Christian law and doctrine, the see of our Lord himself, the chief Pastor.

He therefore, who, as the Fathers tell us, was by our Lord himself constituted bishop of that city, and the first of all bishops, might best pretend to be in special manner our Lord's vicar or successor:** "He," saith Epiphanius, "did first receive the episcopal chair, and to him our Lord first did intrust his own throne on earth."††

He accordingly did first exercise the authority of presiding and moderating in the first ecclesiastical synod, as St. Chrysostom in his notes thereon doth remark.

* Cyril. Cat. 6. † Aug. de Sanct. 27.

‡ P. Agatho, in 6 Syn. Act. iv. p. 35. P. Adrian, in 7 Syn. Act. ii. p. 554.

§ Nicol. I. Ep. 7. Plat. in Greg. VII. &c.

|| Ambr. Serm. 66. Aug. de Sanct. 27. Max. Taur. Serm. 54.

¶ Hieron. in Isa. ii. Theod. v. 9. Vide Tert. de Præscr. cap. 20.

** Chrys. in 1 Cor. Or. 11. †† Epiph. hær. 78.

He therefore probably by St. Paul is first named in his report concerning the passages at Jerusalem; and to his orders it seemeth that St. Peter himself did conform; for it is said there, that 'before certain came from St. James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew.'

Hence in the Apostolical Constitutions, in the prayer prescribed for the Church, and for all the governors of it, the bishops of the principal churches being specified by name, St. James is put in the first place, before the bishops of Rome and of Antioch; "Let us pray for the whole episcopacy under heaven, of those who rightly dispense the word of thy truth; and let us pray for our bishop James, with all his parishes; let us pray for our bishop Clemens, and all his parishes; let us pray for Euodius, and all his parishes."*

Hereto consenteth the tradition of those ancient writers aforecited, who call St. James, the bishop of bishops, the bishop of the Apostles, &c.

SUPPOSITION II.

I proceed to examine the next Supposition of the Church monarchists, which is, That St. Peter's primacy, with its rights and prerogatives, was not personal, but derivable to his successors.

Against which supposition I do assert that admitting a primacy of St. Peter, of what kind or to what purpose soever, we yet have reason to deem it merely personal, and not (according to its grounds and its design) communicable to any successors, nor indeed in effect conveyed to any such.

It is a rule in the canon law that "a personal privilege doth follow the person, and is extinguished with the person;"† and such we affirm that of St. Peter; for,

1. His primacy was grounded on personal acts, (such as his cheerful following of Christ, his faithful confessing of Christ, his resolute adherence to Christ, his embracing special revelations from God;) or on personal graces, (his great faith, his special love to our Lord, his singular zeal for Christ's service;) or on personal gifts and endowments, (his courage, resolution, activity, forwardness in apprehension and in speech;) the which advantages are not transient, and consequently a preeminency built on them is not in its nature such.

* Const. Ap. viii. 10. † Reg. Juris, 7. in Sexto.

2. All the pretence of primacy granted to St. Peter is grounded on words directed to St. Peter's person, characterised by most personal adjuncts, as name, parentage, and which exactly were accomplished in St. Peter's personal actings; which therefore it is unreasonable to extend farther.

Our Lord promised to Simon, son of Jona, to build his Church on him: accordingly in eminent manner the Church was founded on his ministry, or by his first preaching, testimony, performances.

Our Lord promised to give him the keys of the heavenly kingdom: this power St. Peter signally did execute in converting Christians, and receiving them by baptism into the Church, by conferring the Holy Ghost, and the like administrations.

Our Lord charged Simon, son of Jonas, to feed his sheep: this he performed by preaching, writing, guiding and governing Christians, as he found opportunity: wherefore, if any thing was couched under those promises or orders singularly pertinent to St. Peter, for the same reason that they were singular, they were personal; for,

These things being in a conspicuous manner accomplished in St. Peter's person, the sense of those words is exhausted; there may not with any probability, there cannot with any assurance, be any more grounded on them; whatever more is inferred must be by precarious assumption; and justly we may cast at those who shall infer it that expostulation of Tertullian, "What art thou, who dost overturn and change the manifest intention of our Lord, personally conferring this on Peter?"*

3. Particularly the grand promise to St. Peter of founding the Church on him cannot reach beyond his person: because there can be no other foundations of a society, than such as are first laid; the successors of those who first did erect a society and establish it, are themselves but superstructures.

4. The apostolical office, as such, was personal and temporary; and therefore, according to its nature and design, not successive or communicable to others in perpetual descendence from them.

It was, as such, in all respects extraordinary, conferred in a special manner, designed for special purposes, discharged by special aids, endowed with special privileges, as was needful for the propagation of Christianity and founding of churches.

* Tertul. de Pud. 21.

To that office it was requisite that the person should have an immediate designation and commission from God; such as St. Paul so often doth insist on for asserting his title to the office: 'Paul, an Apostle, not from men, or by man'—"Not by men," saith St. Chrysostom; "this is a property of the Apostles."*

It was requisite that an Apostle should be able to attest concerning our Lord's resurrection or ascension, either immediately, as the twelve, or by evident consequence, as St. Paul; thus St. Peter implied, at the choice of Matthias: 'Wherefore of those men which have companied with us—must one be ordained to be a witness with us of the resurrection;' and, 'Am I not,' saith St. Paul, 'an Apostle? have I not seen the Lord?' according to that of Ananias, 'The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the voice of his mouth; for thou shalt bear witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.'

It was needful also that an Apostle should be endowed with miraculous gifts and graces, enabling him both to assure his authority and to execute his office; wherefore St. Paul calleth these 'the marks of an Apostle,' the 'which were wrought by him among the Corinthians in all patience, (or perseveringly,) in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.'

It was also, in St. Chrysostom's opinion, proper to an Apostle that he should be able, according to his discretion, in a certain and conspicuous manner to impart spiritual gifts; as St. Peter and St. John did at Samaria; which to do, according to that Father, was "the peculiar gift and privilege of the Apostles."†

It was also a privilege of an Apostle, by virtue of his commission from Christ, to instruct all nations in the doctrine and law of Christ; he had right and warrant to exercise his function everywhere; "His charge was universal and indefinite; the whole world was his province;"‡ he was not affixed to any one place, nor could be excluded from any; he was (as St. Cyril calleth him) "an œcumenical judge," and "an instructor of all the subcelestial world."§

Apostles also did govern in an absolute manner, according to discretion, as being guided by infallible assistance, to the which they might on occasion appeal, and affirm, 'It hath

* Chrys. in Gal. i. 1.
† Chrys. in Act. viii. 18. P. Eugenius IV. in Instit. Arm.
‡ Chrys. in Joh. xxi. § Cyril. γλαφ. in Gen. vii.

seemed good to the Holy Ghost and us.' Whence their writings have passed for inspired, and therefore canonical, or certain rules of faith and practice.

It did belong to them to found churches, to constitute pastors, to settle orders, to correct offences, to perform all such acts of sovereign spiritual power, in virtue of the same divine assistance, 'according to the authority which the Lord had given them for edification;' as we see practised by St. Paul.

In fine, the "apostleship was," as St. Chrysostom telleth us, "a business fraught with ten thousand good things; both greater than all privileges of grace, and comprehensive of them."*

Now such an office, consisting of so many extraordinary privileges and miraculous powers, which were requisite for the foundation of the Church, and the diffusion of Christianity, against the manifold difficulties and disadvantages which it then needs must encounter, was not designed to continue by derivation; for it containeth in it divers things which apparently were not communicated, and which no man without gross imposture and hypocrisy could challenge to himself.

Neither did the Apostles pretend to communicate it; they did indeed appoint standing pastors and teachers in each church; they did assume fellow-laborers or assistants in the work of preaching and governance: but they did not constitute Apostles, equal to themselves in authority, privileges, or gifts; for, "Who knoweth not," saith St. Austin, "that principate of apostleship to be preferred before any episcopacy?"† and, "The bishops," saith Bellarmine,‡ "have no part of the true apostolical authority."§

Wherefore St. Peter, who had no other office mentioned in Scripture, or known to antiquity, beside that of an Apostle, could not have properly and adequately any successor to his office; but it naturally did expire with his person, as did that of the other Apostles.

5. Accordingly, whereas the other Apostles, as such, had no successors, the apostolical office not being propagated, the primacy of St. Peter (whatever it were, whether of order or jurisdiction, in regard to his brethren) did cease with him; for when there were no Apostles extant, there could be no head or prince of the Apostles in any sense.

* Chrys. in Rom. i. Or. 1. tom. viii. p. 114.

† Aug. de Bapt. cont. Don. ii. 1. ‡ Bell. iv. 25.

§ The Apostles themselves do make the apostolate a distinct office from pastors and teachers, which are the standing offices in the Church. Eph. iv. 11. 1 Cor. xii. 28.

6. If some privileges of St. Peter were derived to popes, why were not all? why was not Pope Alexander VI. as holy as St. Peter? why was not Pope Honorius as sound in his private judgment? why is not every Pope inspired? why is not every papal epistle to be reputed canonical? why are not all Popes endowed with power of doing miracles? why doth not the Pope by a sermon convert thousands? (why indeed do Popes never preach?) why doth not he cure men by his shadow? (he is, say they, himself his shadow:) what ground is there of distinguishing the privileges, so that he shall have some, not others? where is the ground to be found?

7. If it be objected that the Fathers commonly do call bishops successors of the Apostles; to assoil that objection we may consider that, whereas the apostolical office virtually did contain the functions of teaching and ruling God's people; the which, for preservation of Christian doctrine and edification of the church, were requisite to be continued perpetually in ordinary standing offices, these indeed were derived from the Apostles, but not properly in way of succession, as by univocal propagation, but by ordination, imparting all the power needful for such offices; which therefore were exercised by persons during the Apostles' lives concurrently, or in subordination to them; even as a dictator at Rome might create inferior magistrates, who derived from him, but not as his successors; for, as Bellarmine himself telleth us, "there can be no proper succession, but in respect of one preceding; but Apostles and bishops were together in the Church."*

The Fathers therefore so in a large sense call all bishops successors of the Apostles; not meaning that any one of them did succeed into the whole apostolical office, but that each did receive his power from some one (immediately or mediately) whom some apostle did constitute bishop, vesting him with authority to feed the particular flock committed to him in way of ordinary charge; according to the sayings of that apostolical person, Clemens Romanus; "The Apostles preaching in regions and cities, did constitute their first converts, having approved them by the Spirit, for bishops and deacons of those who should afterward believe;"† and "having constituted the foresaid, (bishops and deacons,) they withal gave them farther charge, that if they should die, other approved men successively should receive their office:" thus did the bishops supply the room of the Apostles, each in guiding his particular charge,‡

* Bell. de Pont. R. iv. 25. † Clem. ad Corinth. i. p. 54.
‡ Cypr. Ep. 55.

all of them together, by mutual aid, conspiring to govern the whole body of the Church.

8. In which regard it may be said that not one single bishop, but all bishops together through the whole Church, do succeed St. Peter, or any other Apostle; for that all of them, in union together, have an universal sovereign authority, commensurate to an Apostle.

9. This is the notion which St. Cyprian doth so much insist on, affirming that the bishops do succeed St. Peter, and the other Apostles, by vicarious ordination;* that the bishops are Apostles;† that there is but one chair by the Lord's word built on one Peter;‡ one undivided bishopric, diffused in the peaceful numerosity of many bishops, whereof each bishop doth hold his share;§ one flock, whom the Apostles by unanimous agreement did feed, and which afterwards the bishops do feed;|| having a portion thereof allotted to each, which he should govern.

So the synod of Carthage, with St. Cyprian.

So also St. Chrysostom saith that the sheep of Christ were committed by him to Peter, and to those after him,¶ that is, in his meaning, to all bishops.

10. Such, and no other power, St. Peter might devolve on any bishop ordained by him in any church which he did constitute or inspect; as in that of Antioch, of Alexandria, of Babylon, of Rome.

The like did the other Apostles communicate, who had the same power with St. Peter in founding and settling churches; whose successors of this kind were equal to those of the same kind, whom St. Peter did constitute; enjoying in their several precincts an equal part of the apostolical power, as St. Cyprian often doth assert.

11. It is in consequence observable that in those churches, whereof the Apostles themselves were never accounted bishops, yet the bishops are called successors of the Apostles; which cannot otherwise be understood, than according to the sense which we have proposed; that is, because they succeeded those who were constituted by the Apostles; according to those sayings of Irenæus and Tertullian; "We can number those who were instituted bishops by the Apostles and their successors;"** and, "All the churches do show those, whom,

* Ep. 69. 42. 75. † Ep. 65.
‡ Ep. 40. et Ep. 73. et de Unit. Eccl. § Ep. 52.
|| De Unit. Eccl. Ep. 67. ¶ Chrys. de Sacerd. 1.
** Iren. iii. 3.

being by the Apostles constituted in the episcopal office, they have as continuers of the apostolical seed."*

So, although St. Peter was never reckoned bishop of Alexandria, yet because it is reported that he placed St. Mark there, the bishop of Alexandria is said to succeed the Apostles.†

And because St. John did abide at Ephesus, inspecting that Church, and "appointing bishops there," the bishops of that see did "refer their origin to him."‡

So many bishops did claim from St. Paul.

So St. Cyprian and Firmilian do assert themselves "successors of the Apostles,"§ who yet perhaps never were at Carthage or Cæsarea.

So the church of Constantinople is often in the Acts of the Sixth General Council, called "this great apostolic church," being such churches as those of whom Tertullian saith, that "although they do not produce any of the apostles or apostolical men for their author, yet conspiring in the same faith, are no less, for the consanguinity of doctrine, reputed apostolical."‖

Yea hence St. Jerome¶ doth assert a parity of merit and dignity sacerdotal to all bishops; because, saith he, "all of them are successors to the Apostles;" having all a like power by their ordination conferred on them.

12. Whereas our adversaries do pretend, that indeed the other Apostles had an extraordinary charge as legates of Christ, which had no succession, but was extinct in their persons; but that St. Peter had a peculiar charge, as ordinary pastor of the whole Church, which surviveth.**

To this it is enough to rejoin, that it is a mere figment, devised for a shift, and affirmed precariously; having no ground either in holy Scripture or in ancient tradition; there being no such distinction in the sacred or ecclesiastical writings; no mention occurring there of any office which he did assume, or which was attributed to him, distinct from that extraordinary one of an Apostle; and all the pastoral charge imaginable being ascribed by the ancients to all the Apostles in regard to the whole Church, as hath been sufficiently declared.

13. In fine, if any such conveyance of power (of power so great, so momentous, so mightily concerning the perpetual state

* Tert. de Præscr. 32. † Eus. Hist. iv. 1.

‡ Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. iii. 23. Tert. in Marc. iv. 5. Tert. de Præscr. xxxii.

§ Cypr. Ep. 42. Firmil. in Cypr. Ep. 75.

‖ Tert. de Præscr. 32. ¶ Hier. ad Evagr.

** Bell. iv. 25. &c.

of the Church, and of each person therein) had been made, it had been (for general direction and satisfaction, for voiding all doubt and debate about it, for stifling these pretended heresies and schisms) very requisite that it should have been expressed in some authentic record, that a particular law should have been extant concerning it, that all posterity should be warned to yield the submission grounded thereon.

Indeed a matter of so great consequence to the being and welfare of the Church could scarce have scaped from being clearly mentioned somewhere or other in Scripture, wherein so much is spoken touching ecclesiastical discipline; it could scarce have avoided the pen of the first Fathers, (Clemens, Ignatius, the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions, Tertullian, &c.) who also so much treat concerning the function and authority of Christian governors.

Nothing can be more strange, than that in the statute-book of the New Jerusalem, and in all the original monuments concerning it there should be such a dead silence concerning the succession of its chief magistrate.

Wherefore, no such thing appearing, we may reasonably conclude no such thing to have been, and that our adversaries' assertion of it is wholly arbitrary, imaginary, and groundless.

14. I might add, as a very convincing argument, that if such a succession had been designed, and known in old times, it is morally impossible that none of the Fathers, (Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril, Jerome, Theodoret, &c.) in their exposition of the places alleged by the Romanists for the primacy of St. Peter, should declare that primacy to have been derived and settled on St. Peter's successor: a point of that moment, if they had been aware of it, they could not but have touched, as a most useful application, and direction for duty.

SUPPOSITION III.

They affirm, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome.

CONCERNING which assertion we say, that it may with great reason be denied, and that it cannot anywise be assured; as will appear by the following considerations.

1. St. Peter's being bishop of Rome would confound the offices which God made distinct; for 'God did appoint first apostles, then prophets, then pastors and teachers;' wherefore St. Peter, after he was an Apostle, could not well become a

bishop; it would be such an irregularity, as if a bishop should be made a deacon.

2. The offices of an apostle and of a bishop are not in their nature well consistent; for the apostleship is an extraordinary office, charged with instruction and government of the whole world, and calling for an answerable care; ("the Apostles being rulers," as St. Chrysostom saith, "ordained by God; rulers not taking several nations and cities, but all of them in common intrusted with the whole world;"*) but episcopacy is an ordinary standing charge, affixed to one place, and requiring a special attendance there; bishops being pastors, who, as St. Chrysostom saith, "do sit and are employed in one place."† Now he that hath such a general care, can hardly discharge such a particular office; and he that is fixed to so particular attendance, can hardly look well after so general a charge: either of those offices alone would suffice to take up a whole man; as those tell us who have considered the burden incumbent on the meanest of them; the which we may see described in St. Chrysostom's discourses concerning the priesthood.

Baronius saith of St. Peter, that "it was his office, not to stay in one place, but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over the whole world, and to bring those who did not yet believe to the faith, but thoroughly to establish believers:"‡ if so, how could he be bishop of Rome, which was an office inconsistent with such vagrancy?

3. It would not have beseemed St. Peter, the prime Apostle, to assume the charge of a particular bishop; it had been a degradation of himself, and a disparagement to the apostolical majesty, for him to take on him the bishopric of Rome; as if the King should become mayor of London; as if the bishop of London should be vicar of Pancras.

4. Wherefore it is not likely that St. Peter, being sensible of that superior charge belonging to him, which did exact a more extensive care, would vouchsafe to undertake an inferior charge.

We cannot conceive that St. Peter did affect the name of a bishop, as now men do, allured by the baits of wealth and power, which then were none: if he did affect the title, why did he not in either of his Epistles, (one of which, as they would persuade us, was written from Rome,) inscribe himself bishop of Rome?

* Chrys. tom. viii. p. 115. † Chrys. in Eph. iv. 11.
‡ Baron. ann. lviii. §. 51.

Especially considering that, being an Apostle, he did not need any particular authority, that involving all power, and enabling him in any particular place to execute all kinds of ecclesiastical administrations: there was no reason that an Apostle (or universal bishop) should become a particular bishop.

5. Also St. Peter's general charge of converting and inspecting the Jews, dispersed over the world, ('his apostleship,' as St. Paul calleth it, 'of the circumcision,') which required much travel, and his presence in divers places, doth not well agree to his assuming the episcopal office at Rome.

Especially at that time, when they first make him to assume it; which was in the time of Claudius, who, as St. Luke and other histories do report, did banish all the Jews from Rome,* as Tiberius also had done before him: he was too skilful a fisherman to cast his net there, where there were no fish.

6. If we consider St. Peter's life, we may well deem him uncapable of this office; which he could not conveniently discharge; for it, as history doth represent it, and may be collected from divers circumstances of it, was very unsettled; he went much about the world, and therefore could seldom reside at Rome.

Many have argued him to have never been at Rome; which opinion I shall not avow, as bearing a more civil respect to ancient testimonies and traditions; although many false and fabulous relations of that kind having crept into history and common vogue,† many doubtful reports having passed concerning him, many notorious forgeries having been vented about his travels and acts, (all that is reported of him out of Scripture having a smack of the legend,) would tempt a man to suspect any thing touching him which is grounded only on human tradition; so that the forger of his Epistle to St. James might well induce him saying, "If while I do yet survive, men dare to feign such things of me, how much more will they dare to do so after my decease?"‡

But at least the discourses of those men have evinced that it is hard to assign the time when he was at Rome; and that he could never long abide there. For,

The time which old tradition assigneth of his going to Rome is rejected by divers learned men, even of the Roman party.§

* Acts xviii. 2. Sueton. in Claud. 25. in Tib. 36.

† Euseb. iii. 3. ‡ Petr. ad Jacob.

§ Scal. in Euseb. p. 189. Onuph. apud Bell. ii. 6. Vales. in Euseb. ii. 16.

He was often in other places; sometimes at Jerusalem, sometimes at Antioch, sometimes at Babylon, sometimes at Corinth, sometimes probably at each of those places unto which he directeth his Catholic epistles; among which Epiphanius saith, that "Peter did often visit Pontus and Bithynia."*

And that he seldom was at Rome may well be collected from St. Paul's writings; for he writing at different times one epistle to Rome, and divers epistles from Rome, (that to the Galatians, that to the Ephesians, that to the Philippians, that to the Colossians, and the second to Timothy,) doth never mention him, sending any salutation to him, or from him.

Particularly St. Peter was not there, when St. Paul mentioning Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus, addeth, 'These alone my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, who have been a comfort unto me.'

He was not there, when St. Paul said, 'At my first defence no man stood with me, but all men forsook me.'

He was not there immediately before St. Paul's death, (when 'the time of his departure was at hand,') when he telleth Timothy that 'all the brethren did salute him,' and naming divers of them, he omitteth Peter.

Which things being considered, it is not probable that St. Peter would assume the episcopal chair of Rome, he being little capable to reside there, and for that other needful affairs would have forced him to leave so great a church destitute of their pastor.

7. It was needless that he should be bishop, for that by virtue of his apostleship (involving all the power of inferior degrees) he might, whenever he should be at Rome, exercise episcopal functions and authority. What need a sovereign prince to be made a justice of peace?

8. † Had he done so, he must have given a bad example of non-residence; a practice that would have been very ill relished in the primitive Church, as we may see by several canons interdicting offences of kin to it, (it being, I think, then not so known as nominally to be censured,) and culpable on the same ground; and by the sayings of Fathers condemning practices approaching to it.‡

Even later synods, in more corrupt times, and in the declension of good order, yet did prohibit this practice.§

Epiphanius therefore did well infer that it was needful the

* Epiph. Hær. 27.
† Conc. Nic. can. 16. Conc. Ant. can. 3. &c.
‡ Athan. Apol. 1. P. Paschal. II. Ep. 22.
§ Conc. Lat. 2. (sub Innoc. II.) can. 10.

Apostles should constitute bishops resident at Rome; "It was," saith he, "possible that, the Apostles Peter and Paul yet surviving, other bishops should be constituted; because the Apostles often did take journeys into other countries, for preaching Christ: but the city of Rome could not be without a bishop."*

9. If St. Peter were bishop of Rome, he thereby did offend against divers other good ecclesiastical rules, which either were in practice from the beginning, or at least the reason of them was always good, on which the Church did afterward enact them; so that either he did ill in thwarting them, or the Church had done it in establishing them, so as to condemn his practice.

10. It was against rule that any bishop should desert one church, and transfer himself to another;† and indeed against reason, such a relation and endearment being contracted between a bishop and his church, which cannot well be dissolved.

But St. Peter is by ecclesiastical historians reported (and by Romanists admitted) to have been bishop of Antioch for seven years together.‡

He therefore did ill to relinquish that church, "that most ancient and truly apostolic church of Antioch,"§ (as the Constantinopolitan Fathers called it,) and to place his see at Rome.

This practice was esteemed bad, and of very mischievous consequence; earnestly reproved, as heinously criminal, by great Fathers; severely condemned by divers synods.

Particularly a transmigration from a lesser and poorer to a greater and more wealthy bishopric, (which is the present case,) was checked by them, as rankly savoring of selfish ambition or avarice.

The synod of Alexandria, (in Athanasius,) in its epistle to all Catholic bishops, doth say that Eusebius, by passing from Berytus to Nicomedia, had annulled his episcopacy, making it an adultery, worse than that which is committed by marriage on divorce; "Eusebius," say they, "did not consider the Apostle's admonition, Art thou bound to a wife? do not seek to be loosed: for if it be said of a woman, how much more of a church; of the same bishopric; to which one being tied, ought not to seek another, that he may not be found also an adulterer, according to the holy Scripture?"‖ Surely when they said this, they did forget what St. Peter was said to have

* Epiph. Hær. 27. † Apost. Can 14.
‡ Theodor. Ep. 86. § Theod. v. 6.
‖ Syn. Alex. apud Athan. p. 727.

done in that kind; as did also the Sardican Fathers in their synodical letter, extant in the same Apology of Athanasius, condemning "translations from lesser cities unto greater dioceses."*

The same practice is forbidden by the synods of Nice I. of Chalcedon, of Antioch, of Sardica, of Arles I. &c.

In the synod under Mennas, it was laid to the charge of Anthimus, that having been bishop of Trabisond, he had "adulterously snatched the see of Constantinople, against all ecclesiastical laws and canons."†

Yea, great Popes of Rome, (little considering how peccant therein their predecessor Pope Peter was,) Pope Julius and Pope Damasus, did greatly tax this practice; whereof the latter in his synod at Rome did excommunicate all those who should commit it.‡

In like manner Pope Leo I.§

These laws were so indispensable, that in respect to them Constantine M. who much loved and honored Eusebius, (acknowleging him in the common judgment of the world deserving to be bishop of the whole Church,) did not like that he should accept the bishopric of Antioch, to which he was invited; and commended his waving it, as an act not only "consonant to the ecclesiastical canons, but acceptable to God and agreeable to apostolical tradition:" so little aware was the good emperor, of St. Peter being translated from Antioch to Rome.

In regard to the same law, Gregory Nazianzen (a person of so great worth, and who had deserved so highly of the church at Constantinople) could not be permitted to retain his bishopric of that church, to which he had been called from that small one of Sasima. "The synod," saith Sozomen, "observing the ancient laws, and the ecclesiastical rule, did receive his bishopric from him, being willingly offered, nowise regarding the great merits of the person;"‖ the which synod surely would have excluded St. Peter from the bishopric of Rome; and it is observable that Pope Damasus did approve and exhort those Fathers to that proceeding.¶

We may indeed observe that Pope Pelagius II. did excuse the translation of bishops by the example of St. Peter; "For who ever dareth to say," argueth he, "that St. Peter the

* Syn. Alex. apud Ath. p. 765. † Conc. sub. Menn. p. 9.
‡ Theod. v. 11. § P. Leo I. Ep. lxxxiv. c. 4.
‖ Sozom. vii. 7.
¶ P. Damasi Epist. apud Holsten. p. 41. et R. Marc. v. 21.

prince of the Apostles did not act well, when he changed his see from Antioch to Rome?"*

But I think it more advisable to excuse St. Peter from being author of a practice judged so irregular, by denying the matter of fact laid to his charge.

11. It was anciently deemed a very irregular thing, "contrary," saith St. Cyprian, "to the ecclesiastical disposition, contrary to the evangelical law, contrary to the unity of Catholic institution;"† "a symbol," saith another ancient writer, "of dissension, and disagreeable to ecclesiastical law;"‡ which therefore was condemned by the synod of Nice, by Pope Cornelius, by Pope Innocent I. and others, that two bishops should preside together in one city.§

This was condemned with good reason; for this on the Church's part would be a kind of spiritual polygamy; this would render a church a monster with two heads; this would destroy the end of episcopacy, which is unity and prevention of schisms.||

But if St. Peter was bishop of Rome, this irregularity was committed: for the same authority on which St. Peter's episcopacy of Rome is built, doth also reckon St. Paul bishop of the same; the same writers do make both founders and planters of the Roman Church, and the same call both bishops of it: wherefore if episcopacy be taken in a strict and proper sense, agreeable to this controversy, that rule must needs be infringed thereby.

Irenæus saith, "that the Roman Church was founded and constituted by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul;"¶ Dionysius of Corinth calleth it "the plantation of Peter and Paul;"** Epiphanius saith that "Peter and Paul were first at Rome both Apostles and bishops;"†† so Eusebius implieth, saying that Pope Alexander "derived a succession in the fifth place from Peter and Paul."‡‡

Wherefore both of them were Roman bishops, or neither of them: in reason and rule neither of them may be called so in a strict and proper sense; but in a larger and improper sense both might be so styled.

* Pelag. II. Ep. 1.
† Cypr. Ep. 44. (ut et Ep. 46. 52. 55. 58.)
‡ Soz. iv. 15.
§ Syn. Nic. can. 8. Corn. ap. Eus. vi. 43. Cypr. Ep. 46. P. Innoc. ap. Sozom. viii. 26. Opt. I. Cathedra una.
|| In remedium schismatis. Hier. ¶ Iren. iii. 3. iii. 1.
** Dionys. Corinth. apud Euseb. ii. 25.
†† Epiph. Hær. 27. ‡‡ Euseb. iv. 1.

Indeed that St. Paul was in some acception bishop of Rome (that is, had a supreme superintendence or inspection of it) is reasonable to affirm; because he did for a good time reside there, and during that residence could not but have the chief place, could be subject to no other; 'He,' saith St. Luke, 'did abide two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that entered in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, no man forbidding him.'

It may be inquired if St. Peter was bishop of Rome, how he did become such? did our Lord appoint him such? did the Apostles all or any constitute him? did the people elect him? did he put himself into it? Of none of these things there is any appearance, nor any probability. *Non constat.*

SUPPOSITION IV.

They affirm, that St. Peter did continue bishop of Rome after his translation, and was so at his decease.

AGAINST which assertions we may consider:

1. Ecclesiastical writers do affirm that St. Peter (either alone, or together with St. Paul) did constitute other bishops; wherefore St. Peter was never bishop, or did not continue bishop there.

Irenæus saith that "the Apostles founding and rearing that Church, delivered the episcopal office into the hands of Linus;"* if so, how did they retain it in their own hands or persons? could they give, and have?

Tertullian saith that "St. Peter did ordain Clement."†

In the Apostolical Constitutions, (a very ancient book, and setting forth the most ancient traditions of the Church,) the Apostles ordering prayers to be made for all bishops, and naming the principal, do reckon, not St. Peter, but Clement; "Let us pray for our bishop James, for our bishop Clemens, for our bishop Euodius," &c.

These reports are consistent, and reconciled by that which the Apostolical Constitutions affirm; that "Linus was first ordained bishop of the Roman Church by Paul; but Clemens after the death of Linus by Peter in the second place."‡

Others between Linus and Clemens do interpose Cletus, or

* Iren. apud Euseb. v. 6. † Tert. de Præscr. 32.
‡ Const. Apost. vii. 46.

Anacletus, (some taking these for one, others for two persons,) which doth not alter the case.*

Now hence we may infer both that St. Peter never was bishop; and on supposition that he was, that he did not continue so. For,

2. If he had ever been bishop, he could not well lay down his office, or subrogate another, either to preside with him, or to succeed him; according to the ancient rules of discipline, and that which passed for right in the primitive Church.

This practice Pope Innocent I. condemned, as irregular, and never known before his time; "We," saith he in his Epistle to the clergy and people of Constantinople, "never had known these things to have been adventured by our fathers, but rather to have been hindered; for that none hath power given him to ordain another in the place of one living:"† he did not (it seems) consider that St. Peter had used such a power.

Accordingly the synod of Antioch (to secure the tradition and practice of the Church, which began by some to be infringed) did make this sanction, that "it should not be lawful for any bishop to constitute another in his room to succeed him; although it were at the point of death."‡

3. But supposing St. Peter were bishop once, yet by constituting Linus or Clemens in his place he ceased to be so, and divested himself of that place; for it had been a great irregularity for him to continue bishop together with another.

That being, in St. Cyprian's judgment, the ordination of Linus had been void and null: for, "Seeing," saith that holy martyr, "there cannot after the first be any second, whoever is after one, who ought to be sole bishop, he is not now second, but none."§

On this ground, when the emperor Constantius would have procured Felix to sit bishop of Rome together with Pope Liberius, at his return from banishment, (after his compliance with the Arians) the people of Rome would not admit it, exclaiming, "One God, one Christ, one bishop;" and whereas Felix soon after that died, the historian remarketh it as "a special providence of God, that Peter's throne might not suffer

* Euseb. iii. 4. 13. Aug. Ep. 165. Epiph. Hær. 27. Opt. 2. Tertull. poem. in Marc. iii. 9. Phot. Cod. 112. (p. 290.)

N. Eusebius (iii. 2.) saith, that Linus did sit bishop after the martyrdom of St. Peter: but this is not so probable, as that which the author of the Constitutions doth affirm, which reconcileth the dissonances of writers.

† P. Inn. I. apud Soz. viii. 26. ‡ Syn. Ant. Can. 23.

§ Cypr. Ep. 52.

infamy, being governed under two prelates;"* he never considered that St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Peter and Linus, had thus governed that same church.

On this account St. Austin being assumed by Valerius with him to be bishop of Hippo, did afterward discern and acknowlege his error.†

In fine, to obviate this practice, so many canons of councils (both general and particular) were made, which we before did mention.

4. In sum, when St. Peter did ordain others, (as story doth accord in affirming,) either he did retain the episcopacy, and then (beside need, reason, and rule) there were concurrently divers bishops of Rome at one time; or he did quite relinquish and finally divorce himself from the office, so that he did not die bishop of Rome, the which overturneth the main ground of the Romish pretence.‡ Or will they say that St. Peter, having laid aside the office for a time, did afterward before his death resume it? then what became of Linus, of Cletus, of Clemens? were they dispossessed of their place, or deposed from their function? would St. Peter succeed them in it? This in Bellarmine's own judgment "had been plainly intolerable."§

5. To avoid all which difficulties in the case, and perplexities in story, it is reasonable to understand those of the ancients, who call Peter bishop of Rome, and Rome the place, the chair, the see of Peter, as meaning that he was bishop or superintendent of that church, in a large sense; because he did found the church by converting men to the Christian faith; because he did erect the chair by ordaining the first bishops; because he did, in virtue both of his apostolical office and his special parental relation to that church, maintain a particular inspection over it, when he was there: which notion is not new; for of old Ruffinus affirmeth that he had it, not from his own invention, but from tradition of others; "Some," saith he, "inquire how, seeing Linus and Cletus were bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, Clement himself, writing to James, could say that the see was delivered to him by Peter: whereof this reason has been given us, viz. that Linus and Cletus were indeed bishops of Rome before Clement, but Peter being yet living, viz. that they might take the episcopal charge, but he fulfilled the office of the apostleship."‖

6. This notion may be confirmed by divers observations.

* Theod. Hist. ii. 17. † Aug. Ep. 110.

‡ Greg. I. Ep. vi. 37. Innoc. I. Ep. 21. Bell. ii. 12. §. At vero——.

§ Bell. ii. 6. ‖ Ruffin. in Præf. ad Clem. Recogn.

It is observable that the most ancient writers,* living nearest the fountains of tradition, do not expressly style St. Peter bishop of Rome, but only say that he did found that church, instituting and ordaining bishops there ; as the other Apostles did in the churches which they settled; so that the bishops there in a large sense did succeed him, as deriving their power from his ordination, and supplying his room in the instruction and governance of that great church. Yea their words, if we well mark them, do exclude the Apostles from the episcopacy.† Which words the later writers (who did not foresee the consequence, nor what an exorbitant superstructure would be raised on that slender bottom, and who were willing to comply with the Roman bishops, affecting by all means to reckon St. Peter for their predecessor) did easily catch, and not well distinguishing, did call him bishop, and St. Paul also, so making two heads of one church.

7. It is also observable that in the recensions of the Roman bishops, sometimes the Apostles are reckoned in, sometimes excluded.

So Eusebius calleth Clemens the third bishop of Rome, yet before him he reckoneth Linus and Anacletus.‡

And of Alexander he saith that "he deduced his succession in the fifth place from Peter and Paul,"§ that is, excluding the Apostles.

And Hyginus is thus accounted sometime the eighth, sometime the ninth bishop of Rome.

The same difference in reckoning may be observed in other churches; for instance, although St. Peter is called no less bishop of Antioch, than of Rome, by the ancients, yet Eusebius saith, that "Euodius was first bishop of Antioch ;"|| and another "bids the Antiocheans remember Euodius, who was first intrusted with the presidency over them by the Apostles."

Other instances may be seen in the notes of Cotelerius on the Apostolical Constitutions, where he maketh this general observation.

"It is an usual custom with the Apostles, according to their power, ordinary or extraordinary, episcopal or apostolical, to prefix," &c. :¶ but it was needless to suppose these two powers, when one was sufficient, it virtually containing the other.

This is an argument that the ancients were not assured in

* Const. Apost. vii. 46. Iren. iii. 3. Tertull. † Iren. iii. 3.
‡ Euseb. iii. 4. 13. 15. Iren. iii. 3. § Euseb. iv. 1.
|| Euseb. Chron. p. 7. Hist. iii. 22. Pseud. Ignat. ad Ant.
¶ Cotel. Not. p. 299.

opinion, that the Apostles were bishops, or that they did not esteem them bishops in the same notion with others.

8. It is observable that divers churches did take denomination from the Apostles, and were called apostolical thrones, or chairs,* not because the Apostles themselves did sit bishops there, but because they did exercise their apostleship, in teaching; and in constituting bishops there,† who, as Tertullian saith, "did propagate the apostolical seed."

So was Ephesus esteemed, because St. Paul did found it, and ordained Timothy there; and because St. John did govern and appoint bishops there.‡

So was Smyrna accounted, because Polycarpus was settled there by the Apostles, or by St. John.§

So Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, "had a controversy about metropolitical rights with Acacius bishop of Cæsarea, as presiding in an apostolical see."‖

So Alexandria was deemed, because St. Mark was supposed by the appointment of St. Peter to sit there.

So were Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi called by Tertullian,¶ because St. Paul did found them, and furnish them with pastors; in which respect peculiarly the bishops of those places were called successors of the Apostles.

So Constantinople did assume the title of an apostolical church,** probably because, according to tradition, St. Andrew did found that church, although Pope Leo I. would not allow it that appellation.

On the same account might Rome at first be called an apostolical see; although afterward the Roman bishops did rather pretend to that denomination, on account of St. Peter being bishop there: and the like may be said of Antioch. ††

9. It is observable that the author of the Apostolical Constitutions, reciting the first bishops constituted in several churches, doth not reckon any of the Apostles; particularly not Peter, or Paul, or John.

10. Again, any Apostle wherever he did reside by virtue of his apostolical office, without any other designation or assumption of a more special power, was qualified to preside there,

* Tert. de Præscr. 32. Soz. i. 17.
† Aug. de Doctr. Ch. ii. 8. Tertull de Præscr. 32.
‡ Iren. iii. 3. Tertull. in Marc. iv. 5. Apost. Const. vii. 46.
§ Iren. iii. 3. Tertull. de Præscr. 32. Euseb. iii. 36.
‖ Sozom. iv. 25. ¶ De Præscr. 36.
** Syn. Chalc. Act. x. p. 379. 284. Niceph. ii. 39. P. Leo. I. Ep. 54.
†† Greg. M. Ep. iv. 37.

exercising a superintendency comprehensive of all episcopal functions; so that it was needless that he should take on himself the character or style of a bishop.

This (beside the tenor of ancient doctrine) doth appear from the demeanor of St. John,* who never was reckoned bishop of Ephesus; nor could be, without displacing Timothy, who by St. Paul was constituted bishop there, or succeeding in his room; yet he abiding at Ephesus, did there discharge the office of a metropolitan; "governing the churches, and in the adjacent churches here constituting bishops, there forming whole churches, otherwhere allotting to the clergy persons designed by the Spirit."†

Such functions might St. Peter execute in the parts of Rome or Antioch, without being a bishop; and as the bishops of Asia did, saith Tertullian,‡ refer their original to St. John, so might the bishops of Italy, on the like ground, refer their original to St. Peter.

It is observable that, whereas St. Peter is affirmed to have been bishop of Antioch seven years before his access to Rome,§ that is, within the compass of St. Luke's story, yet he passeth over a matter of so great moment; as St. Jerome observeth.‖

I cannot grant that, if St. Luke had thought Peter sovereign of the Church, and his episcopacy of a place a matter of such consequence, he would have slipped it over, being so obvious a thing, and coming in the way of his story.

He therefore, I conceive, was no bishop of Antioch, although a bishop at Antioch.¶

11. If in objection to some of these discourses it be alleged that St. James, our Lord's near kinsman, although he was an Apostle, was made bishop of Jerusalem; and that for the like reason St. Peter might assume the bishopric of Rome;

I answer:

1. It is not certain that St. James the bishop of Jerusalem was an Apostle, (meaning an Apostle of the primary rank;) for Eusebius (the greatest antiquary of the old times) doth reckon him one of the seventy disciples.**

So doth the author of the Apostolical Constitutions in divers places suppose.††

* Syn. Chal. Act. 11. 2 Tim. i. 6. † Euseb. Hist. iii. 23.
‡ Tertull. in Marc. iv. 5.
§ An. Ch. 39. Baron. §. 8. Acts ix. 32. xi. 20.
‖ Hier. in Gal. 2.
¶ It is the distinction of a Pope. Rex Etruriæ, et Rex in Etruria.
** Euseb. i. 12.
†† Apost. Const. vi. 12. 14. ii. 55. vii. 46. &c.

Hegesippus (that most ancient historian) was of the same mind, who saith that there were many of this name, and that this James did undertake the church with the Apostles.*

Of the same opinion was Epiphanius,† who saith that St. James was the son of Joseph by another wife.

The whole Greek Church doth suppose the same, keeping three distinct solemnities for him and the two Apostles of the same name.

Gregory Nyssen, St. Jerome, and divers other ancient writers, do concur herein, whom we may see alleged by Grotius, Dr. Hammond, (who themselves did embrace the same opinion,) Valesius, Blondel, &c.

Salmasius (after his confident manner) saith, "it is certain, that he was not one of the twelve :‡" I may at least say, it is not certain that he was, and consequently the objection is grounded on an uncertainty.

2. Granting that St. James was one of the Apostles, (as some of the ancients seem to think,§ calling him an Apostle; and as divers modern divines conceive, grounding chiefly on these words of St. Paul, 'But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother,' and taking apostles there in the strictest sense,) I answer,

That the case was peculiar, and there doth appear a special reason why one of the Apostles should be designed to make a constant residence at Jerusalem, and consequently to preside there like a bishop. For Jerusalem was the metropolis, the fountain, the centre of the Christian religion, where it had birth, where was greatest matter and occasion of propagating the gospel, most people disposed to embrace it resorting thither; where the church was very numerous, consisting, as St. Luke (or St. James in him) doth intimate, 'of divers myriads of believing Jews;' whence it might seem expedient that a person of greatest authority should be fixed there for the confirming and improving that church, together with the propagation of religion among the people, which resorted thither; the which might induce the Apostles to settle St. James there, both for discharging the office of an apostle, and the supplying the room of a bishop there.

According to him, saith Eusebius, "the episcopal throne was committed by the Apostles;"‖ or, "Our Lord," saith Epiphanius,¶ "did intrust him with his own throne."

* Euseb. ii. 23.
† Epiph. Hær. 78.
‡ Sal. Mess. p. 20.
§ Aug. cont. Cresc. ii. 37.
‖ Euseb. ii. 23.
¶ Epiph. Hær. 78.

But there was no need of fixing an apostle at other places; nor doth it appear that any was so fixed; especially St. Peter was uncapable of such an employment, requiring settlement and constant attendance, who, beside his general apostleship, had a peculiar apostleship of the dispersed Jews committed to him; who therefore was much engaged in travel for propagation of the faith, and edifying his converts everywhere.

3. The greater consent of the most ancient writers making St. James not to have been one of the twelve Apostles, it is thence accountable why (as we before noted) St. James was called by some ancient writers, the bishop of bishops, the prince of bishops, &c. because he was the first bishop of the first see, the mother church; the Apostles being excluded from the comparison.

On these considerations we have great reason to refuse the assertion or scandal cast on St. Peter, that he took on him to be bishop of Rome, in a strict sense, as it is understood in this controversy.

SUPPOSITION V.

A farther assertion is this, superstructed by consequence on the former, that the bishops of Rome, (according to God's institution, and by original right derived thence,) should have an universal supremacy and jurisdiction (containing the privileges and prerogatives formerly described) over the Christian Church.

THIS assertion to be very uncertain, yea, to be most false, I shall by divers considerations evince.

1. If any of the former Suppositions be uncertain, or false, this assertion, standing on those legs, must partake of those defects, and answerably be dubious or false. If either Peter was not monarch of the Apostles, or if his privileges were not successive, or if he were not properly bishop of Rome at his decease, then farewell the Romish claim; if any of those things be dubious, it doth totter; if any of them prove false, then down it falleth.

But that each of them is false, hath, I conceive, been sufficiently declared; that all of them are uncertain, hath at least been made evident.

The structure therefore cannot be firm which relieth on such props.

2. Even admitting all those suppositions, the inference from

them is not assuredly valid. For St. Peter might have an universal jurisdiction, he might derive it by succession, he might be bishop of Rome; yet no such authority might hence accrue to the Roman bishop, his successor in that see.

For that universal jurisdiction might be derived into another channel, and the bishop of Rome might in other respects be successor to him, without being so in this.

As for instance in the Roman empire, before any rule of succession was established therein, the emperor was sovereign governor, and he might die consul of Rome, having assumed that place to himself; yet when he died, the supreme authority did not lapse into the hands of the consul who succeeded him, but into the hands of the senate and people; his consular authority only going to his successor in that office. So might St. Peter's universal power be transferred unto the ecclesiastical college of bishops, and of the Church; his episcopal inferior authority over the singular παροικία, or province of Rome, being transmitted to his followers in that chair.

3. That in truth it was thus, and that all the authority of St. Peter, and of all other Apostles, was devolved to the Church, and to the representative body thereof, the Fathers did suppose; affirming the Church to have received from our Lord a sovereign power.

"This," saith St. Cyprian, "is that one Church, which holdeth and possesseth all the power of its Spouse and Lord; in this we preside; for the honor and unity of this we fight—;"* saith he, in his Epistle to Jubianus, wherein he doth impugn the proceedings of Pope Stephanus: the which sentence St. Austin appropriateth to himself,† speaking it absolutely, without citing St. Cyprian. To this authority of the Church, St. Basil would have all that confess the faith of Christ to submit; "To which end we exceedingly need your assistance, that they who confess the apostolic faith would renounce the schisms which they have devised, and submit themselves henceforth to the authority of the Church." ‡

§They (after the holy Scripture, which saith that 'each bishop hath a care of God's Church,' and 'is obliged to feed the Church of God'—and 'is appointed to edify the body of Christ') do suppose the administration of the ecclesiastical affairs concerning the public state of the Church, the defence of the common faith, the maintenance of order, peace, and

* Cypr. Ep. 73. † Aug. de Bapt. cont. Don. iv. 1.
‡ Bas. Epist. 69.
§ Cypr. Ep. lxvii. 52. Apost. Const. viii. 10.

unity jointly to belong unto the whole body of pastors; according to that of St. Cyprian to Pope Stephanus himself, "Therefore, most dear brother, the body of priests is copious, being joined together by the glue of mutual concord, and the bond of unity, that if any of our college should attempt to make heresy, and to tear or waste the flock of Christ, the rest may come to succor; and like useful and merciful shepherds may re-collect the sheep into the flock."* And again, "Which thing it concerns us to look after and redress, most dear brother, who bearing in mind the divine clemency, and holding the scales of the Church-government," &c.†

So even the Roman clergy did acknowlege, "For we ought all of us to watch for the body of the whole Church, whose members are digested through several provinces." ‡

"Like the Trinity, whose power is one and undivided, there is one priesthood among divers bishops." §

So in the Apostolical Constitutions, the Apostles tell the bishops that "an universal episcopacy is intrusted to them." ‖

So the council of Carthage with St. Cyprian—"Clear and manifest is the mind and meaning of our Lord Jesus Christ, sending his Apostles, and affording to them alone the power given him of the Father; in whose room we succeeded, governing the Church of God with the same power." ¶

"Christ our Lord and our God going to the Father, commended his spouse to us." **

A very ancient instance of which administration is the proceeding against Paulus Samosatenus; when "the pastors of the Churches, some from one place, some from another, did assemble together against him as a pest of Christ's flock, all of them hastening to Antioch;" †† where they deposed, exterminated, and deprived him of communion, warning the whole Church to reject and disavow him.

"Seeing the pastoral charge is common to us all, who bear the episcopal office, although thou sittest in a higher and more eminent place." ‡‡

"Therefore for this cause the holy Church is committed to you and to us, that we may labor for all, and not be slack in yielding help and assistance to all." §§

* Cypr. Ep. 67. † Ibid.
‡ Cler. Rom. apud Cypr. Ep. 30.
§ P. Symmachus ad Eonium Arelat. ‖ Const. Apost. vi. 14.
¶ Conc Carth. apud Cypr. p. 405. ** Ibid. p. 404.
†† Euseb. vii. 27.
‡‡ Aug. ad Bonif. contra duas Epist. Pelag. i. 1.
§§ P. Joh. I. Ep. 1. (ad Zachar.) apud Bin. tom. iii. p. 812.

Hence St. Chrysostom said of Eustathius his bishop; "For he was well instructed and taught by the grace of the Holy Spirit, that a president or bishop of a church ought not to take care of that church alone, wherewith he is intrusted by the Holy Ghost, but also of the whole Church dispersed throughout the world."*

They consequently did repute schism, or ecclesiastical rebellion, to consist in "a departure from the consent of the body of the priesthood,"† as St. Cyprian in divers places doth express it, in his epistles to Pope Stephen and others.

They deem all bishops to partake of the apostolical authority, according to that of St. Basil to St. Ambrose: "The Lord himself hath translated thee from the judges of the earth unto the prelacy of the Apostles."‡

They took themselves all to be vicars of Christ, and judges in his stead; according to that of St. Cyprian; "For heresies are sprung up, and schisms grown from no other ground nor root but this, because God's priest was not obeyed, nor was there one priest or bishop for a time in the Church, nor a judge thought on for a time to supply the room of Christ."§ Where that by Church is meant any particular church, and by priest a bishop of such church, any one not bewitched with prejudice by the tenor of St. Cyprian's discourse will easily discern.‖

They conceive that our Saviour did promise to St. Peter the keys in behalf of the Church, and as representing it.

They suppose the combination of bishops in peaceable consent and mutual aid, to be the rock on which the Church is built.

They allege the authority granted to St. Peter as a ground of claim to the same in all bishops jointly, and in each bishop singly, according to his *rata pars*, or allotted proportion.

"Which may be easily understood by the words of our Lord, when he says to blessed Peter, whose place the bishops supply, Whatsoever," &c.¶

"I have the sword of Constantine in my hands, you of Peter," said our great King Edgar.

They do therefore in this regard take themselves all to be successors of St. Peter, that his power is derived to them all, and that the whole episcopal order "is the chair by the Lord's voice founded on St. Peter:" thus St. Cyprian in divers places

* Chrys. tom. v. Or. 93. † Cypr. Ep. 67. Ep. 52.
‡ Basil. Ep. 56. § Cypr. Ep. 55.
‖ Ambr. in 1 Cor. 11. ¶ Capit. Caroli M. lib. v. cap. 163.

(before touched) discourseth; and thus Firmilian from the keys granted to St. Peter inferreth, disputing against the Roman bishop; "Therefore," saith he, "the power of remitting sins is given to the Apostles, and to the churches, which they being sent from Christ did constitute, and to the bishops, which do succeed them by vicarious ordination."*

4. The bishops of any other churches founded by the Apostles, in the Fathers' style are successors of the Apostles, in the same sense, and to the same intent, as the bishop of Rome is by them accounted successor of St. Peter; the apostolical power, which in extent was universal, being in some sense, in reference to them, not quite extinct, but transmitted by succession: yet the bishops of apostolical churches did never claim, nor allowedly exercise, apostolical jurisdiction beyond their own precincts; according to those words of St. Jerome, "Tell me, what doth Palestine belong to the bishop of Alexandria."†

This showeth the inconsequence of their discourse; for in like manner the Pope might be successor to St. Peter, and St. Peter's universal power might be successive, yet the Pope have no singular claim thereto, beyond the bounds of his particular church.

5. So again, for instance, St. James (whom the Roman Church, in her liturgies, doth avow for an Apostle) was bishop of Jerusalem more unquestionably than St. Peter was bishop of Rome; Jerusalem also was the root, and 'the mother of all churches,'‡ (as the Fathers of the Second General Synod, in their letter to Pope Damasus himself, and the occidental bishops did call it, forgetting the singular pretence of Rome to that title.)

Yet the bishops of Jerusalem, successors of St. James, did not thence claim I know not what kind of extensive jurisdiction; yea, notwithstanding their succession, they did not so much as obtain a metropolitical authority in Palestine, which did belong to Cæsarea, (having been assigned thereto, in conformity to the civil government,) and was by special provision reserved thereto in the synod of Nice;§ whence St. Jerome did not stick to affirm that the bishop of Jerusalem was subject to the bishop of Cæsarea;‖ for speaking to John bishop of Jerusalem, who for compurgation of himself from errors imputed to him had appealed to Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, he saith, "Thou hadst rather cause molestation to ears pos-

* Firmil. apud Cypr. Ep. 75.
† Hier. ad Pammach. Ep. lxi. 15. ‡ Theodor. v. 9.
§ Conc. Nic. can. 7. ‖ Hier. Ep. lxi. 15.

sessed, than render honor to thy metropolitan,"* that is, to the bishop of Cæsarea.

By which instance we may discern what little consideration sometimes was had of personal or topical succession to the Apostles in determining the extent of jurisdiction: and why should the Roman bishop on that score pretend more validity than others?

6. St. Peter probably ere that he came at Rome did found divers other churches,† whereof he was paramount bishop, or did retain a special superintendency over them; particularly "Antioch was anciently called his see,"‡ and he is acknowleged to have sat there seven years, before he was bishop of Rome.

Why therefore may not the bishop of Antioch pretend to succeed St. Peter in his universal pastorship, as well as his younger brother of Rome? why should Euodius, ordained by St. Peter at Antioch, yield to Clemens, afterward by him ordained at Rome?

Antioch was the first-born of Gentile churches, where the name of Christians was first heard; Antioch was (as the Constantinopolitan Fathers called it) "the most ancient and truly apostolical church."§

Antioch, by virtue of St. Peter's sitting there, or peculiar relation to it, was (according to their own conceits) the principal see.

Why therefore should St. Peter be so unkind to it, as not only to relinquish it, but to debase it; not only transferring his see from it, but divesting it of the privilege which it had got?

Why should he prefer before it the city of Rome, the mystical Babylon, "the mother of abominations of the earth," the throne of Satan's empire, the place which did then most persecute the Christian faith, and "was drunk with the blood of the saints?"¶

7. The ground of this preference was, say they, St. Peter's will: and they have reason to say so; for otherwise if St. Peter had died intestate, the elder son of Antioch would have had the best right to all his goods and dignities.**

But how doth that will appear? in what tables was it written? in what registers is it extant? in whose presence did he nuncupate it? It is nowhere to be seen or heard of.

* Hier. ad Pammach. Ep. lxi. 15.
† Hier. ad Galat. 2. P. Pelag. II. Ep. 1.
‡ Syn. Chalced. Act. vii. p. 264. § Theod. v. 9.
¶ Tertull. adv. Jud. cap. 9. ** Ibid.

Neither do they otherwise know of it, than by reasoning it out; and in effect they say only that it was fit he should will it: but they may be mistaken in their divinations; and perhaps notwithstanding them St. Peter might will as well to his former see of Antioch, as to his latter of Rome.

8. Indeed Bellarmine sometimes positively and briskly enough doth affirm that "God did command St. Peter to fix his see at Rome:" but his proofs of it are so ridiculously fond and weak, that I grudge the trouble of reciting them; and he himself sufficiently confuteth them, by saying otherwhere, "It is not unprobable that our Lord gave an express command, that Peter should so fix his see at Rome, that the bishop of Rome should absolutely succeed him."*

He saith it is not improbable; if it be no more than so, it is uncertain; it may be a mere conjecture or a dream.

It is much more not unprobable, that if God had commanded it, there would have been some assurance of a command so very important.

9. Antioch hath at least a fair plea for a share in St. Peter's prerogatives; for it did ever hold the repute of an apostolical church, and on that score some deference was paid to it: why so, if St. Peter did carry his see with all its prerogatives to another place? But if he carried with him only part of his prerogative, leaving some part behind at Antioch, how much then, I pray, did he leave there? why did he divide unequally, or leave less than half? If perchance he did leave half, the bishop of Antioch is equal to him of Rome.

10. Other persons also may be found, who according to equal judgment might have a better title to the succession of Peter in his universal authority than the Pope; having a nearer relation to him than he, (although his successor in one charge,) or on other equitable grounds.

For instance, St. John, or any other Apostle, who did survive St. Peter: for if St. Peter was the father of Christians, (which title yet our Saviour forbiddeth any one to assume,) St. John might well claim to be his eldest son; and it had been a very hard case for him to have been postponed in the succession; it had been a derogation to our Lord's own choice, a neglect of his special affection, a disparagement of the apostolical office, for him to be subjected to any other; neither could any other pretend to the like gifts for management of that great charge.

11. The bishop of Jerusalem might with much reason have

* Bell. ii. 12. §. Et quoniam.

put in his claim thereto, as being successor of our Lord himself, who unquestionably was the High-priest of our profession, and Archbishop of all our souls; whose see was the mother of all churches; wherein St. Peter himself did at first reside, exercising his vicarship: if our Lord, on special accounts out of course, had put the sovereignty in St. Peter's hands, yet after his decease it might be fit that it should return into its proper channel.

This may seem to have been the judgment of the times, when the author of the Apostolical Constitutions did write, who reporteth the Apostles to have ordered prayers to be made first for James, then for Clement, then for Euodius.

12. Equity would rather have required that one should by common consent and election of the whole Church be placed in St. Peter's room, than that the bishop of Rome, by election of a few persons there, should succeed into it.

As the whole body of pastors was highly concerned in that succession, so it was reasonable that all of them should concur in designation of a person thereto; it is not reasonable to suppose that either God would institute, or St. Peter by will should devise a course of proceeding in such a case so unequal and unsatisfactory.

If therefore the Church, considering this equity of the case, together with the expediency of affairs in relation to its good, should undertake to choose for itself another monarch, (the bishop of another see, who should seem fitter for the place,) to succeed into the prerogatives of St. Peter, that person would have a fairer title to that office than the Pope; for such a person would have a real title, grounded on some reason of the case; whenas the Pope's pretence doth only stand on a positive institution, whereof he cannot exhibit any certificate. This was the mind of a great man among themselves; who saith, that "if possibly the bishop of Triers should be chosen for head of the Church. For the Church has free power to provide itself a head."*

Bellarmine himself confesseth,† that "if St. Peter" (as he might have done if he had pleased) "should have chosen no particular see, as he did not for the first five years, then after Peter's death, neither the bishop of Rome nor of Antioch had succeeded, but he whom the Church should have chosen for itself."† Now if the Church on that supposition would have had such a right, it is not probable that St. Peter by his fact would have deprived it thereof, or willingly done any thing in preju-

* Card. Cus. de Conc. Cath. ii. 13——. † Bell. ii. 12.

dice to it; there being apparently so much equity, that the Church should have a stroke in designation of its pastor.

In ancient times there was not any small church which had not a suffrage in the choice of its pastor; and was it fitting that all the Church should have one imposed on it without its consent?*

If we consider the manner in ancient time of electing and constituting the Roman bishop, we may thence discern, not only the improbability, but iniquity of this pretence: how was he then chosen? was it by a general synod of bishops, or by delegates from all parts of Christendom, whereby the common interest in him might appear, and whereby the world might be satisfied that one was elected fit for that high office? No; he was chosen, as usually then other particular bishops were, by the clergy and people of Rome; none of the world being conscious of the proceeding, or bearing any share therein.

Now was it equal that such a power of imposing a sovereign on all the grave bishops, and on all the good people of the Christian world, should be granted to one city?

Was it fitting that such a charge, importing advancement above all pastors, and being intrusted with the welfare of all souls in Christendom, should be the result of an election liable to so many defects and corruptions; which assuredly often, if not almost constantly, would be procured by ambition, bribery, or partiality; would be managed by popular faction and tumults?

It was observed generally of such elections by Nazianzen, that "prelacies were not got rather by virtue than by naughtiness; and that episcopal thrones did not rather belong to the more worthy than to the more powerful."†

And declaring his mind or wish, that elections of bishops should "rest only or chiefly in the best men; not in the wealthiest and mightiest; or in the impetuousness and unreasonableness of the people, and among them in those who are most easily bought and bribed;"‡ whereby he intimateth the common practice, and subjoineth, "But now I can hardly avoid thinking that the popular (or civil) governances are better ordered than ours, which are reputed to have divine grace attending them."

And that the Roman elections in that time were come into that course, we may see by the relation and reflections of an honest Pagan historian concerning the election of Pope Da-

* P. Leo I. Ep. 92. P. Celest. I. Ep. 2. Grat. Dist. 61. cap. 13.
† Naz. Or. xx. p. 335. ‡ Greg. Naz. Or. xix. p. 310.

masus, (contemporary of Gregory Nazianzen;) "Damasus," saith he, "and Ursinus, above human measure burning with desire to snatch the episcopal see, did, with divided parties, most fiercely conflict;"* in which conflict on one day, in the very church, an hundred and thirty persons were slain;† so did that great Pope get into the chair: thus, as the historian reflecteth, the "wealth and pomp of the place naturally did provoke ambition" by all means to seek it,‡ and did cause fierce contentions to arise in the choice; whence commonly, wise and modest persons being excluded from any capacity thereof, any ambitious and cunning man, who had the art or the luck to please the multitude, would by violence obtain it: which was a goodly way of constituting a sovereign to the Church.

Thus it went within three ages after our Lord: and afterwards, in the declensions of Christian simplicity and integrity, matters were not like to be mended, but did indeed rather grow worse; as beside the reports and complaints of historians, how that commonly by ambitious prensations, by simoniacal corruptions, by political bandyings, by popular factions, by all kinds of sinister ways, men crept into the place, doth appear by those many dismal schisms, which gave the Church many pretended heads, but not one certain one; as also by the result of them, being the choice of persons very unworthy and horribly flagitious.§

If it be said that the election of a Pope in old times was wont to be approved by the consent of all bishops in the world, according to the testimony of St. Cyprian, who saith of Cornelius, that "he was known by the testimony of his fellow bishops, whose whole number through all the world did with peaceful unanimity consent:"‖

I answer, that this consent was not in the election, or antecedently to it; that it was only by letters or messages declaring the election, according to that of St. Cyprian;¶ that it was not anywise peculiar to the Roman bishop, but such as was yielded to all catholic bishops, each of whom "was to be approved," as St. Cyprian saith, "by the testimony and judgment of his colleagues;"** that it was in order only to the maintaining fraternal communion and correspondence, signifying that such a bishop was duly elected by his clergy and people, was rightly ordained by his neighbor bishops, did profess the

* Am. Marcell. lib. 27. † Sozom. vi. 23.

‡ Am. Marcell. lib. 27.

§ Plat. (p. 314.) Plat. in Silv. 3. Plat. in Steph. 6. Baron. ann. 112. §. 8. Plat. in Clem. ii. (p. 313.) Bern. de Consid. iv. 2.

‖ Cypr. Ep. 52. ¶ Ibid. 42. ** Ibid. 41.

Catholic faith, and was therefore qualified for communion with his brethren: such a consent to the election of any bishop of old was given, (especially on occasion, and when any question concerning the right of a bishop did intervene,) whereof now in the election of a pope no footstep doth remain.

We may also note that the election of Cornelius being contested, he did more solemnly acquaint all the bishops of the world with his case, aad so did obtain their approbation in a way more than ordinary.

13. If God had designed this derivation of universal sovereignty, it is probable that he would have prescribed some certain, standing, immutable way of election, and imparted the right to certain persons, and not left it at such uncertainty to the chances of time, so that the manner of election hath often changed, and the power of it tossed into divers hands.

"And though in several times there have been observed several ways as to the election of the Roman pontiffs, according as the necessity and expediency of the church required."*

Of old it was (as other elections) managed by nomination of the clergy, and suffrage of the people.

Afterward the emperors did assume to themselves the nomination, or approbation of them.

"For then nothing was done by the clergy in the choice of the Pope, unless the emperor had approved his election."†

"But he, seeing the prince's consent was required, sent messengers with letters, to entreat Mauritius, that he would not suffer the election made by the clergy and people of Rome in that case to be valid."‡

"Leo VIII. being tired out with the inconstancy of the Romans, transferred the whole power and authority of choosing the Pope from the clergy and people of Rome, to the emperor."§

At some times the clergy had no hand in the election; but popes were intruded by powerful men or women at their pleasure.‖

Afterwards the cardinals (that is, some of the chief Roman clergy) did appropriate the election to themselves; by the decree of Pope Nicholas II. in his Lateran synod.¶

Sometimes, out of course, general synods did assume the choice to themselves; as at Constance, Pisa, and Basil.

* Conc. Bas. Sess. xxxvii. p. 98. Vide Grat. Dist. 63. per tot.
† Plat. in Pelag. II.
‡ Plat. in Greg. M. Vide Grat. dist. 63.
§ Plat. in Leo VIII. (p. 291.)
‖ Baron. ann. 112. §. 8. ann. 131. §. 1.
¶ Grat. Dist. xxiii. cap. 1. Plat. in Nic. II.

14. From the premises, to conclude the Pope's title to St. Peter's authority, it is requisite to show the power demised by him to be according to God's institution and intent, immutable and indefectible; for power built on the like, but far more certain principles, hath in course of times, and by worldly changes, been quite lost, or conveyed into other channels, than those wherein it was first put; and that irrecoverably, so that it cannot anywise be retrieved, or reduced into the first order.

For instance, Adam was by God constituted universal sovereign of mankind; and into that power his eldest son of right did succeed; and so it of right should have been continually propagated.

Yet soon did that power fail, or was diverted into other courses; the world being cantonised into several dominions; so that the heir at law among all the descendants of Adam cannot so easily be found, as a needle in a bottle of hay; he probably is a subject, and perhaps is a peasant.

So might St. Peter be monarch of the Church, and the Pope might succeed him; yet by revolutions of things, by several defaults and incapacities in himself, by divers obstructions incident, by forfeiture on incroaching on other men's rights, according to that maxim of a great Pope, "He loseth his own, who coveteth more than his due,"* his power might be clipped, might be transplanted, might utterly decay and fail; to such fatalities other powers are subject; nor can that of the Pope be exempt from them, as otherwhere we shall more largely declare.

15. Indeed that God did intend his Church should perpetually subsist united in any one political frame of government, is a principle which they do assume and build on, but can nowise prove. Nor indeed is it true. For,

If the unity of the Church designed and instituted by God were only an unity of faith, of charity, of peace, of fraternal communion and correspondence between particular societies and pastors, then in vain it is to seek for the subject and seat of universal jurisdiction. Now that God did not intend any other unity, than such as those specified, we have good reason to judge, and shall, we hope, otherwhere sufficiently prove.

16. We may consider that really the sovereign power (such as it is pretended) hath often failed, there having been for long spaces of time no Roman bishops at all, on several accounts; which is a sign that the Church may subsist without it.

As, 1. When Rome was desolated by the Goths, Vandals, and Lombards.

* P. Leo I. Ep. 54.

2. In times, when the Romans would not suffer Popes to live with them.*

3. In case of discontinuance from Rome, when the Popes (so calling themselves) did for above seventy years abide in France; when they indeed, not being chosen by the Roman people, nor exercising pastoral care over them, were only titular, not real bishops of Rome; (they were Popes of Avignon, not of Rome; and successors of God knows who, not of St. Peter;) no more than one continually living in England be bishop of Jerusalem.

4. In times of many long schisms, (twenty-two schisms,) when either there was no true Pope, or, which in effect was the same, no certain one.

5. When popes were intruded by violence, whom Baronius† himself positively affirmeth to have been no popes: how then could a succession of true popes be continued from them, by the clergy, which they in virtue of their papal authority did pretend to create?

6. When elections had a flaw in them, were uncanonical, and so null.

7. When popes were simoniacally chosen; who by their own rules and laws are no true popes; being heretics, heresiarchs.‡

The which was done for long courses of time very commonly, and in a manner constantly.§

8. When popes have been deposed; (as some by the emperors, others by general councils;) in which case, according to papal principles, the successors were illegal; for the Pope being sovereign, he could not be judged or deposed; and his successor is an usurper.

9. When popes were heretical, that is (say they) no popes.

10. When atheists, sorcerers,—

Elections in some of these cases being null, and therefore the acts consequent to them invalid, there is probably a defailance of right continued to posterity.¶

And probably therefore there is now no true pope.

For (on violent intrusion, or simoniacal choice, or any usurpation) the cardinals, bishops, &c. which the Pope createth, are not truly such; and consequently their votes not good in the choice of another Pope; and so successively.

* Vide Bern. Ep. 242. 243. Bell. iv. 4.
† Baron. ad an. 112. §. 8.
‡ P. Greg. VII. Ep. iii. 7. P. Jul. in Conc. Lat. Sess. v. p. 57.
§ Plat. in Serg. 3. (p. 279.) Vid.——in Bened. IV. p. 277.
¶ Plat. in Joh. x. (p. 275.) Reg. Jur. 2. in Sexto.

These considerations may suffice to declare the inconsequence of their discourses, even admitting their assertions, which yet are so false, or so apparently uncertain.

I shall in the next place level some arguments directly against their main conclusion itself.

I. My first argument against this pretence shall be, that it is destitute of any good warrant, either from divine or human testimony; and so is groundless. As will appear by the following considerations.

1. If God had designed the bishop of Rome to be for the perpetual course of times sovereign monarch of his Church, it may reasonably be supposed that he would expressly have declared his mind in the case;* it being a point of greatest importance of all that concern the administration of his kingdom in the world. Princes do not use to send their viceroys unfurnished with patents, clearly signifying their commission, that no man, out of ignorance or doubt concerning that point, excusably may refuse compliance; and in all equity promulgation is requisite to the establishment of any law, or exacting obedience. But in all the pandects of divine revelation the bishop of Rome is not so much as once mentioned, either by name, or by character, or by probable intimation; they cannot hook him in otherwise than by straining hard, and framing a long chain of consequences; each of which is too subtle for to constrain any man's persuasion: they have indeed found the Pope in the first chapter of Genesis; for (if we believe Pope Innocent III.) he is one of the "two great luminaries" there;† and he is as plainly there as any where else in the Bible.

Wherefore if on this account we should reject this pretence, we might do it justly; and for so doing we have the allowance of the ancient Fathers; for they did not hold any man obliged to admit any point of doctrine, or rule of manners, which is not in express words, or in terms equivalent, contained in holy Scripture; or which at least might not be thence deduced by clear and certain inference: this their manner of disputing with heretics and heterodox people doth show; this appeareth by their way of defining and settling doctrines of faith; this they often do avow in plain words applicable to our case; for, "If," saith St. Austin, "about Christ, or about his Church, or about any other thing which concerneth our faith and life, I will not say we, who are nowise comparable to him who said, Although we; but even as he going on did add, If an angel from heaven

* Melch. can. vi. 8.

† Innoc. III. in Decret. Greg. I. xxxiii. 6.

should tell you, beside what you have received in the legal and evangelical Scriptures, let him be anathema :"* in which words we have St. Austin's warrant not only to refuse, but to detest this doctrine, which being nowhere extant in law or gospel, is yet obtruded on us, as nearly relating both to Christ and his Church, as greatly concerning both our faith and practice.

2. To enforce this argument, we may consider that the Evangelists do speak about the propagation, settlement, and continuance of our Lord's kingdom ; that the Apostles do often treat about the state of the Church and its edification, order, peace, unity ; about the distinction of its officers and members, about the qualifications, duties, graces, privileges of spiritual governors and guides ; about prevention and remedy of heresies, schisms, disorders : on any of which occasions how is it possible that the mention of such a spiritual monarch (who was to have a main influence on each of those particulars,) should wholly escape them, if they had known such an one instituted by God.

In the Levitical law all things concerning the high-priest, not only his designation, succession, consecration, duty, power, maintenance, privileges, but even his garments, marriage, mourning, &c. are punctually determined and described ; and is it not wonderful that in the many descriptions of the new law no mention should be made concerning any duty or privilege of its high-priest, whereby he might be directed in the administration of his office, and know what observance to require ?

3. Whereas also the Scripture doth inculcate duties of all sorts, and doth not forget frequently to press duties of respect and obedience toward particular governors of the Church ; is it not strange that it never should bestow one precept whereby we might be instructed and admonished to pay our duty to the universal Pastor ; especially considering that God, who directed the pens of the Apostles, and who intended that their writings should continue for the perpetual instruction of Christians, did foresee how requisite such a precept would be to secure that duty ? for if but one such precept did appear, it would do the business, and void all contestation about it.

4. They who so carefully do exhort to honor and obey the temporal sovereignty, how come they so wholly to wave urging the no less needful obligations to obey the spiritual monarch ? while they are so mindful of the emperor, why are they so

* Aug. contr. Petil. iii. 6.

neglectful of the Pope; insomuch that divers Popes afterward, to ground and urge obedience to them, are fain to borrow those precepts which command obedience to princes, accommodating them by analogy and inference to themselves?

5. Particularly St. Peter, one would think, who doth so earnestly enjoin to obey 'the king as supreme,' and 'to honor him,' should not have been unmindful of his successors; or quite have forborne to warn Christians of the respect due to them; surely the Popes afterward do not follow him in this reservedness; for in their Decretal Epistles they urge nothing so much as obedience to the apostolical see.

6. One might have expected something of that nature from St. Paul himself, who did write so largely to the Romans, and so often from Rome; that at least some word, or some intimation should have dropped from him concerning these huge rights and privileges of this see, and of the regard due to it. Particularly then, when he professedly doth enumerate the offices instituted by God, for standing use and perpetual duration; 'for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of faith,' &c.*

He commendeth them for their faith, which 'was spoken of through the whole world;' yet "giving them no advantage above others;" as St. Chrysostom observeth on those words, 'for obedience to the faith among all nations, among whom also are ye.' "This," saith St. Chrysostom, "he saith, to depress their conceit, to void their haughtiness of mind, and to teach them, (to deem others equal in dignity with them.)"

†When he writeth to that Church, (which was some time after St. Peter had settled the popedom,) he doth only style them κλητοὶ ἅγιοι, ('called saints,') and ἀγαπητοὶ Θεοῦ, ('beloved of God,') which are common adjuncts of all Christians: he saith their faith was spoken of generally, but of the fame of their authority being so spread he taketh no notice: that 'their obedience had come abroad to all men,' but their commands had not (it seemeth) come anywhere.

He wrote divers epistles from Rome, wherein he resolveth many cases debated, yet never doth urge the authority of the Roman church for any point, which now is so ponderous an argument.

7. But however seeing the Scripture is so strangely reserved, how cometh it to pass that tradition is also so defective, and

* Cl. Rom. ad Cypr. Ep. 31.

† (Vid. Chrys. Theo. Hier.) Baron. an. 58. §. 46. &c.

stanch in so grand a case? We have in divers of the Fathers (particularly in Tertullian,* in St. Basil, in St. Jerome) catalogues of traditional doctrines and observances, which they recite to assert tradition in some cases supplemental to Scripture; in which their purpose did require that they should set down those of principal moment; and they are so punctual, as to insert many of small consideration: how then came they to neglect this, concerning the papal authority over the whole Church, which had been most pertinent to their design, and in consequence did vastly surpass all the rest which they do name?

8. The designation of the Roman bishop by succession to obtain so high a degree in the Church, being above all others a most remarkable and noble piece of history, which it had been a horrible fault in an ecclesiastical history to slip over, without careful reporting and reflecting on it; yet Eusebius, that most diligent compiler of all passages relating to the original constitution of the Church, and to all transactions therein, hath not one word about it; who yet studiously doth report the successions of the Roman bishops, and all the notable occurrences he knew concerning them, with favorable advantage.

9. Whereas this doctrine is pretended to be a point of faith, of vast consequence to the subsistence of the Church and to the salvation of men, it is somewhat strange that it should not be inserted into any one ancient summary of things to be believed, (of which summaries divers remain, some composed by public consent, others by persons of eminency in the Church,†) nor by fair and forcible consequence should be deducible from any article in them; especially considering that such summaries were framed on occasion of heresies springing up, which disregarded the Pope's authority, and which by asserting it were plainly confuted. We are therefore beholden to Pope Innocent III. and his Lateran synod, for first synodically defining this point, together with other points no less new and unheard of before. The Creed of Pope Pius IV. formed the other day, is the first, as I take it, which did contain this article of faith.

10. It is much that this point of faith should not be delivered in any of those ancient expositions of the Creed (made by St. Austin, Ruffin, &c.) which enlarge it to necessary points of doctrine, connected with the articles therein, especially with

* De Cor. Mil. 3. Basil. de Sp. S. 27. Hier. advers. Lucif. 4.
† Const. Apost. vii. 41.

that of the Catholic Church, to which the Pope's authority hath so close a connexion; that it should not be touched in the catechetical discourses of Cyril, Ambrose, &c.; that in the systems of divinity composed by St. Austin, Lactantius, &c. it should not be treated on: the world is now changed; for the catechism of Trent doth not overlook so material a point; and it would pass for a lame body of theology which should omit to treat on this subject.

11. It is more wonderful that this point should never be defined, in downright and full terms, by any ancient synod; it being so notoriously in those old times opposed by divers who dissented in opinion, and discorded in practice from the Pope; it being also a point of that consequence, that such a solemn declaration of it would have much conduced to the ruin of all particular errors and schisms, which were maintained then in opposition to the Church.

12. Indeed had this point been allowed by the main body of orthodox bishops, the Pope could not have been so drowsy or stupid, as not to have solicited for such a definition thereof; nor would the bishops have been backward in compliance thereto; it being, in our adversaries' conceit, so compendious and effectual a way of suppressing all heresies, schisms, and disorders; (although indeed later experience hath showed it no less available to stifle truth, justice, and piety;) the Popes after Luther were better advised, and so were the bishops adhering to his opinions.

13. Whereas also it is most apparent that many persons disclaimed this authority, not regarding either the doctrines or decrees of the popes; it is wonderful that such men should not be reckoned in the large catalogues of heretics, wherein errors of less obvious consideration, and of far less importance, did place men; if Epiphanius, Theodoret, Leontius, &c. were so negligent or unconcerned, yet St. Austin, Philastrius,—western men, should not have overlooked this sort of desperate heretics: Aërius, for questioning the dignity of bishops, is set among the heretics; but who got that name for disavowing the Pope's supremacy, among the many who did it? (it is but lately that such as we have been thrust in among heretics.)

14. Whereas no point avowed by Christians could be so apt to raise offence and jealousy in Pagans against our religion as this, which setteth up a power of so vast extent and huge influence; whereas no novelty could be more surprising or startling, than the erection of an universal empire over the consciences and religious practices of men; whereas also this

doctrine could not but be very conspicuous and glaring in ordinary practice; it is prodigious that all Pagans should not loudly exclaim against it.

It is strange that Pagan historians (such as Marcellinus, who often speaketh of Popes, and blameth them for their luxurious way of living, and pompous garb;* as Zozimus, who bore a great spite at Christianity; as all the writers of the imperial history before Constantine) should not report it, as a very strange pretence newly started up.

It is wonderful that the eager adversaries of our religion (such as Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles, Julian himself) should not particularly level their discourse against it, as a most scandalous position and dangerous pretence, threatening the government of the empire.

It is admirable that the emperors themselves, inflamed with emulation and suspicion of such an authority, (the which hath been so terrible even to Christian princes,) should not in their edicts expressly decry and impugn it; that indeed every one of them should not with extremest violence implacably strive to extirpate it.

In consequence of these things it may also seem strange that none of the advocates of our faith (Justin, Origen, Tertullian, Arnobius, Cyril, Austin) should be put to defend it, or so much as forced to mention it, in their elaborate apologies for the doctrines and practices which were reprehended by any sort of adversaries thereto.

We may add that divers of them in their apologies† and representations concerning Christianity would have appeared not to deal fairly, or to have been very inconsiderate, when they profess for their common belief assertions repugnant to that doctrine; as when Tertullian saith, "We reverence the emperor as a man second to God, and less only than God;"‡ when Optatus affirmeth, that "above the emperor there is none beside God, who made the emperor;"§ and, that "Donatus by extolling himself (as some now do) above the emperor, did in so doing, as it were, exceed the bounds of men, that he did esteem himself as God, not as a man."|| When St. Chrysostom asserteth "the emperor to be the crown and head of all men on earth;"¶ and saith, that even Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, any men whoever,** are to be subject to the temporal powers; when St. Cyril calleth the emperor "the supreme top

* Marcell lib. xxvii. p. 338. † Tertull. Apolog. cap. 30.
‡ Tertull. ad Scap. 2. § Opt. lib. 3. || Id. ibid.
¶ Chrys. ἀνδρ. ii. p. 463. ** Chrys. in Rom. xiii. 1.

of glory among men, elevated above all others by incomparable differences,"* &c. When even Popes talk at this rate; as Pope Gregory I. calling the emperor his lord, and lord of all;† telling the emperor that his competitor, by assuming the title of universal bishop, "did set himself above the honor of his imperial majesty;" which he supposeth a piece of great absurdity and arrogance: and even Pope Gregory II. doth call that emperor (against whom he afterward rebelled) the head of Christians.‡ Whereas, indeed, if the Pope be monarch of the Church, endowed with the regalities which they now ascribe to him, it is plain enough that he is not inferior to any man living, in real power and dignity: wherefore the modern doctors of Rome are far more sincere or considerate in their heraldry, than were those old Fathers of Christendom; who now stick not downrightly to prefer the Pope before all princes of the world; not only in doctrine and notion, but in the sacred offices of the Church: for in the very canon of their mass, the Pope (together with the bishop of the diocese, one of his ministers) is set before all Christian princes; every Christian subject being thereby taught to deem the Pope superior to his prince. Now we must believe (for one Pope hath written it, another hath put it in his decretals, and it is current law) that the papal authority doth no less surpass the royal, than the sun doth outshine the moon.§

Now it is abundantly declared by papal definition, "as a point necessary to salvation," that "every human creature (neither king nor Cæsar excepted) is subject to the Roman high-priest."‖

Now the mystery is discovered, why Popes, when summoned by emperors, declined to go in person to general synods; because "it was not tolerable that the emperor (who sometime would be present in synods) should sit above the Pope;"¶ as in the pride of his heart he might perhaps offer to do. (I cannot forbear to note what an ill conceit Bellarmine had of Leo I. and other Popes, that they did forbear coming at synods out of their villanous pride and haughtiness.)

15. One would admire that Constantine, if he had smelt this doctrine, or any thing like it in Christianity, should be so

* Cyril. ad Theod. in Conc. Eph. part. i. cap. 3. p. 20.

† Ibid. P. Greg. I. Ep. iv. 32.

‡ P. Greg. II. in Epist. 1. ad Leon. Isaur. apud Bin. tom. v. p. 502.

§ Gab. Biel. in Can. mis.

‖ P. Bonif. VIII. in Extrav. com. lib. i. tit. 38.

¶ Bell. de Conc. i. 19.

ready to embrace it; or that so many emperors should in those times do so; some princes then probably being jealous of their honor, and unwilling to admit any superior to them.

It is at least much, that emperors should with so much indulgence foster and cherish popes, being their so dangerous rivals for dignity; and that it should be true, which Pope Nicholas doth affirm, that "the emperors had extolled the Roman see with divers privileges, had enriched it with gifts, had enlarged it with benefits;"* had done I know not how many things more for it: surely they were bewitched thus to advance their concurrent competitor for honor and power; one who pretended to be a better man than themselves. Bellarmine (in his Apology against King James) saith, that "the pope was (*vellet, nollet*) constrained to be subject to the emperors, because his power was not known to them;" it was well it was not: but how could it be concealed from them, if it were a doctrine commonly avowed by Christians? it is hard keeping so practical a doctrine from breaking forth into light. But to leave this consideration.

Farthermore, we have divers ancient writings, the special nature, matter, scope whereof did require, or greatly invite giving attestation to this power, if such an one had been known and allowed in those times; which yet do afford no countenance, but rather much prejudice thereto.

16. The Apostolical Canons,† and the Constitutions of Clement, which describe the state of the Church, with its laws, customs, and practices current in the times of those who compiled them, (which times are not certain, but ancient, and the less ancient the more it is to our purpose,) wherein especially the ranks, duties, and privileges of all ecclesiastical persons are declared or prescribed, do not yet touch the prerogatives of this universal head, or the special respects due to him, nor mention any laws or constitutions framed by him: which is no less strange than that there should be a body of laws, or description of the state of any kingdom, wherein nothing should be said concerning the king, or the royal authority: it is not so in our modern Canon Law, wherein the Pope doth make *utramque paginam;* we read little beside his authority, and decrees made by it.

The Apostolical Canons particularly do prescribe that "the bishops of each nation should know him that is first among them, and should esteem him the head, and should do nothing

* P. Nich. I. Epist. 8. ad Mich. Imp.

† Const. Apost. viii. 4. &c.

considerable (or extraordinary) without his advice;"* as also that "each one (of those head bishops) should only meddle with those affairs which concerned his own precinct, and the places under it:" also, that "no such primate should do any thing without the opinion of all; that so there may be concord." Now what place could be more opportune to mention the Pope's sovereign power? How could the canonist without strange neglect pass it over? Doth he not indeed exclude it, assigning the supreme disposal (without farther resort) of all things to the arbitration of the whole body of pastors, and placing the maintenance of concord in that course?

17. So also the old writer, under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite,† treating in several places about the degrees of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, was monstrously overseen in omitting the sovereign thereof: in the fifth chapter of his ecclesiastical hierarchy he professeth carefully to speak of those orders, but hath not a word of this supereminent rank, but averreth "episcopacy to be the first and highest of divine orders, in which the hierarchy is consummated:"‡ and in his Epistle to Demophilus there is a remarkable place, wherein he could hardly have avoided touching the Pope, had there been then one in such vogue as now: for advising that monk to gentleness and observance toward his superiors, he thus speaketh: "Let passion and reason be governed by you; but you by the holy deacons, and these by the priests, and the priests by the bishops, and the bishops by the Apostles, or by their successors;" (that is, saith Maximus, those which we now call patriarchs;) "and if perhaps any one of them shall fail of his duty, let him be corrected by those holy persons who are coordinate to him."§ Why not in this case let him be corrected by the Pope, his superior? But he knew none of an order superior to the Apostles' successors.

18. Likewise, Ignatius in many epistles frequently describeth the several ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, extolleth their dignity and authority to the highest pitch, mightily urgeth the respect due to them, yet never doth he so much as mention or touch this sovereign degree, wherein the majesty of the clergy did chiefly shine.

In his very epistle to the Romans he doth not yield any deference to their bishop, nor indeed doth so much as take notice of him. Is it not strange he should so little mind the sovereign of the Church? or was it, for a sly reason, because being bishop

* Apost. Can. 34. † Dionys. de Hier. Eccl. cap. 5.
‡ De Eccl. Hier. cap. 5.
§ Dionys. Ar. Ep. 8. Max. Schol. ibid.

of Antioch he had a pique to his brother Jacob, who had supplanted him, and got away his birthright?

The counterfeiter therefore of Ignatius did well personate him, when he saith, that "in the Church there is nothing greater than a bishop;"* and that "a bishop is beyond all rule and authority;"† for in the time of Ignatius there was no domineering Pope over all bishops.

19. We have some letters of popes, (though not many; for Popes were then not very scribatious, or not so pragmatical; whence, to supply that defect, lest Popes should seem not able to write, or to have slept almost 400 years, they have forged divers for them, and those so wise ones, that we who love the memory of those good Popes disdain to acknowlege them authors of such idle stuff; we have yet some letters of,) and to Popes, to and from divers eminent persons in the Church, wherein the former do not assume, nor the latter ascribe any such power; the Popes do not express themselves like sovereigns, nor the bishops address themselves like subjects; but they treat one another in a familiar way, like brethren and equals: this is so true, that it is a good mark of a spurious epistle, (whereof we have good store, devised by colloguing knaves, and fathered on the first Popes,) when any of them talketh in an imperious strain, or arrogateth such a power to himself.

20. Clemens, bishop of Rome, in the apostolical times unto the church of Corinth, then engaged in discords and factions, wherein the clergy was much affronted, (divers presbyters, who had well and worthily behaved themselves, were ejected from their office, in a seditious manner,) did write a very large epistle; wherein like a good bishop, and charitable Christian brother, he doth earnestly by manifold inducements persuade them to charity and peace;‡ but nowhere doth he speak imperiously, like their prince: in such a case one would think, if ever, for quashing such disorders and quelling so perverse folks, who spurned the clergy, it had been decent, it had been expedient, to employ his authority, and to speak like himself, challenging obedience, on duty to him, and at their peril. How would a modern Pope have ranted in such a case? how thundering a bull would he have dispatched against such outrageous contemners of the ecclesiastical order? how often would he have spoken of the apostolic see and its authority? We should infallibly have heard him swagger in his wonted style, "Whoever shall presume to cross our will, let him know

* Pseud. Ignat. ad Smyrn. † Id. ad Trall.
‡ Clem. ad Corinth. Ep. i. 58. Jun.

that he shall incur the indignation of Almighty God, and his blessed Apostles Peter and Paul." But our Popes, it seemeth, have more wit or better mettle than Pope Clement; that good Pope did not know his own strength, or had not the heart to use it.

21. Among the epistles of St. Cyprian, there are divers epistles of him to several Popes, (to Cornelius, to Lucius, to Stephanus,) in the which, although written with great kindness and respect, yet no impartial eye can discern any special regard to them, as to his superiors in power, or pastors in doctrine, or judges of practice; he reporteth matters to them, he conferreth about points with all freedom;* he speaketh his sense and giveth his advice without any restraint or awe: he spareth not on occasion to reprove their practices, and to reject their opinions; he in his addresses to them and discourses of them styleth them brethren and colleagues; and he continually treateth them as such, on even terms; "When," saith he to the clergy of Rome, "dearest brethren, there was among us an uncertain rumor concerning the decease of the good man my colleague, Fabianus:"† on which words Rigaltius had cause to remark; "How like an equal and fellow-citizen doth the bishop of Carthage mention the bishop of Rome, even to the Roman clergy!"‡ But would not any man now be deemed rude and saucy who should talk in that style of the Pope?

Pope Cornelius also to St. Cyprian § hath some epistles, wherein no glimpse doth appear of any superiority assumed by him. But of St. Cyprian's judgment and demeanor toward Popes we shall have occasion to speak more largely, in a way more positively opposite to the Roman pretences.

Eusebius ‖ citeth divers long passages out of an epistle of Cornelius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, against Novatus; wherein no mark of this supremacy doth appear; although the magnitude and flourishing state of the Roman Church is described, for aggravation of Novatus's schism and ambition.

Pope Julius hath a notable long epistle, extant in one of Athanasius's Apologies, unto the bishops assembled at Antioch; wherein he had the fairest occasion that could be to assert and insist on this sovereign authority, they flatly denying and impugning it; questioning his proceedings as singular, supposing him subject to the laws of the Church no less than any other bishop; and downrightly affirming each of themselves to

* Ep. 55. † Cypr. Ep. 4. ‡ Rigalt. ibid.
§ Cypr. Ep. 46. 48 ‖ Euseb. vi 43.

be his equal: about which point he thought good not to contend with them; but waving pretences to superiority, he justifieth his actions by reasons, grounded on the merit of the cause, such as any other bishop might allege: but this epistle I shall have more particular occasion to discuss.

Pope Liberius hath an epistle to St. Athanasius, wherein he not only (for his direction and satisfaction) doth inquire his opinion about the point; but professeth, in compliment perchance, that he shall obediently follow it; "Write," saith he, "whether you do think as we do, and just so, about the true faith; that I may be undoubtedly assured about what you think good to command me."* Was not that spoken indeed like a courteous sovereign, and an accomplished judge in matters of faith? The same Pope in the head of the western, doth write to a knot of eastern bishops, whom they call "their beloved brethren and fellow-ministers;" and in a brotherly strain, not like an emperor.

In the time of Damasus, successor to Liberius, St. Basil hath divers epistles to the western bishops,† wherein, having represented and bewailed the wretched state of the eastern churches, then overborne with heresies, and unsettled by factions, he craveth their charity, their prayers, "their sympathy, their comfort, their brotherly aid;" by affording to the orthodox and sound party the countenance of their communion, by joining with them in contention for truth and peace; for that the communion of so great Churches would be of mighty weight to support and strengthen their cause; giving credit thereto among the people, and inducing the emperor to deal fairly with them, in respect to such a multitude of adherents; especially of those which were at such a distance, and not so immediately subject to the eastern emperor; for, "If," saith he, "very many of you do concur unanimously in the same opinion, it is manifest that the multitude of consenters will make the doctrine to be received without contradiction;"‡ and, "I know," saith he again, writing to Athanasius about these matters, "but one way of redress to our Churches, the conspiring with us of the western bishops;"§ the which being obtained, "would probably yield some advantage to the public, the secular power revering the credibility of the multitude, and the people all about following them without repugnance:"‖ and, "You," saith he to the western bishops, "the farther you dwell from them, the more credible you will be to the people."¶

* Liber. ad Ath. tom. i. p. 243. † Ep. 61. 69. 70.
‡ Ep. 74. (Ep. 293.) § Ep. 48. ‖ Ibid. ¶ Ep. 74.

This indeed was according to the ancient rule and practice in such cases, that any church being oppressed with error, or distracted with contentions, should from the bishops of other churches receive aid to the removal of those inconveniences. That it was the rule doth appear from what we have before spoken, and of the practice there be many instances: for so did St. Cyprian send two of his clergy to Rome, to compose the schism there, moved by Novatian against Cornelius; so was St. Chrysostom called to Ephesus,* (although out of his jurisdiction,) to settle things there; so (to omit divers instances occurring in history) St. Basil himself was called by the Church of Iconium, "to visit it, and to give it a bishop;" although it did not belong to his ordinary inspection; and he doth tell the bishops of the coasts that they should have done well in sending some to visit and assist his Churches in their distresses.

But now how, I pray, cometh it to pass that in such a case he should not have a special recourse to the Pope; but in so many addresses should only wrap him up in a community? Why should he not humbly petition him to exert his sovereign authority for the relief of the eastern churches, laying his charge, and inflicting censures on the dissenters? Why should he lay all the stress of his hopes on the consent of the western bishops? Why doth he not say a word of the dominion resident in them over all the church? These things are unconceivable, if he did take the Pope to be the man our adversaries say he is.

But St. Basil had other notions:† for indeed, being so wise and good a man, if he had taken the Pope for his sovereign, he would not have taxed him as he doth, and so complain of him: when speaking of the western bishops, (whereof the Pope was the ringleader, and most concerned,) he hath these words, (occasioned, as I conceive, by the bishop of Rome's rejecting that excellent person, Meletius, bishop of Antioch;) "What we should write, or how to join with those that write, I am in doubt; for I am apt to say that of Diomedes, You ought not to request, for he is a haughty man; for in truth observance doth render men of proud manners more contemptuous than otherwise they are.‡ For if the Lord be propitious to us, what other addition do we need? but if the anger of God continue, what help can we have from the western superciliousness? who in truth neither know, nor endure to learn; but being pre-

* Cypr. Ep. 42. ad Cornel. Pallad. Bas. Ep. 8. Ep. 77.
† Vid. Epist. 272 273. 321. 325. 349.
‡ Bas. Ep. 10. ad Euseb. Samos. Ep.

possessed with false suspicions, do now do those things which they did before in the cause of Marcellus; affecting to contend with those who report the truth to them; and establishing heresy by themselves."* Would that excellent person (the greatest man of his time in reputation for wisdom and piety) have thus, unbowelling his mind in an epistle to a very eminent bishop, smartly reflected on the qualities and proceedings of the western clergy, charging them with pride and haughtiness, with a suspicious and contentious humor, with incorrigible ignorance, and indisposition to learn; if he had taken him, who was the leader in all these matters, to have been his superior and sovereign? Would he have added the following words, immediately touching him; "I would in the common name have written to their ringleader, nothing indeed about ecclesiastical affairs, except only to intimate that they neither do know the truth of things with us, nor do admit the way by which they may understand it; but in general about their being bound not to set on those who were humbled with afflictions; nor should judge themselves dignified by pride, a sin which alone sufficeth to make one God's enemy."† Surely this great man knew better what belonged to government and manners, than in such rude terms to accost his sovereign: nor would he have given him that character, which he doth otherwhere: where speaking of his brother, St. Gregory Nyssen, he saith he was an unfit agent to Rome, because "although his address with a sober man would find much reverence and esteem; yet to a haughty and reserved man, sitting I know not where above, and thence not able to hear those below speaking the truth to him, what profit can there be to the public from the converse of such a man, whose disposition is averse from illiberal flattery?"‡ But these speeches suit with that conceit which St. Basil (as Baronius, I know not whence, reporteth) expressed by saying, "I hate the pride of that church;" which humor in them that good man would not be guilty of fostering by too much obsequiousness.

St. Chrysostom,§ having by the practices of envious men combined against him, in a packed assembly of bishops, on vain surmises, been sentenced and driven from his see, did thereon write an epistle to Pope Innocent I. bishop of Rome, together with his brethren the bishops of Italy; therein representing his case, complaining of the wrong, vindicating his innocency, displaying the iniquity of the proceedings against

* Bas. Ep. 10. ad Euseb. Samos. Ep. † Ibid.
‡ Bas. Ep. 250. § Tom. vii. Epist. 122.

him, together with the mischievous consequences of them toward the whole Church, then requiring his succor for redress: yet (although the sense of his case, and care of his interest, were likely to suggest the greatest deference that could be) neither the style, which is very respectful, nor the matter, which is very copious, do imply any acknowlegement of the Pope's supremacy: he doth not address to him as to a governor of all, who could by his authority command justice to be done, but as to a brother, and a friend of innocence, from whose endeavor he might procure relief: he had recourse, not to his sovereign power, but to his brotherly love; he informed his charity, not appealed to his bar; he in short did no more than implore his assistance in an ecclesiastical way; that he would express his resentment of so irregular dealings; that he would avow communion with him, as with an orthodox bishop innocent and abused; that he would procure his cause to be brought to a fair trial in a synod of bishops, lawfully called and indifferently affected. Had the good man had any conceit of the Pope's supremacy, he would, one would think, have framed his address in other terms, and sued for another course of proceeding in his behalf: but it is plain enough, that he had no such notion of things, nor had any ground for such a one. For indeed Pope Innocent, in his answer to him, could do no more than exhort him to patience; in another, to his clergy and people, could only comfort them, declare his dislike of the adversaries' proceedings and grounds; signify his intentions to procure a general synod, with hopes of a redress thence; his sovereign power, it seems, not availing to any such purposes; "But what," saith he, "can we do in such cases? A synodical cognisance is necessary, which we heretofore did say ought to be called; the which alone can allay the motions of such tempests."*

It is true that the later Popes, (Siricius, Anastasius, Innocent, Zozimus, Bonifacius, Celestinus, &c.) after the Sardican Council, in their epistles to the western bishops, over whom they had incroached, and who were overpowered by them, &c. do speak in somewhat more lofty strain; but are more modest toward those of the east, who could not bear, &c.

22. Farther; it is most prodigious that in the disputes managed by the Fathers against heretics, (the Gnostics, Valentinians, Marcionites, Montanists, Manichees, Paulianists, Arians, &c.) they should not, even in the first place, allege and urge the sentence of the universal pastor and judge, as a

* Soz. viii. 26.

most evidently conclusive argument, as the most efficacious and compendious method of convincing and silencing them. Had this point been well proved and pressed, then without any more concertations from Scripture, tradition, reason, all heretics had been quite defeated; and nothing then could more easily have been proved, if it had been true, when the light of tradition did shine so brightly; nothing indeed had been to sense more conspicuous, than the continual exercise of such an authority.

We see now among those who admit such an authority, how surely, when it may be had, it is alleged, and what sway it hath, to the determination of any controversy: and so it would have been then, if it had been then as commonly known and avowed.

23. Whereas divers of the Fathers purposely do treat on methods of confuting heretics, it is strange they should be so blind or dull as not to hit on this most proper and obvious way of referring debates to the decision of him, to whose office of universal pastor and judge it did belong: particularly one would wonder at Vincentius Lirinensis; that he on set purpose, with great care, discoursing about the means of settling points of faith, and of overthrowing heresies, should not light on this notable way, by having recourse to the Pope's magisterial sentence; yea, that indeed he should exclude it; for he ("after most intent study, and diligent inquiry, consulting the best and wisest men,"*) could find but two ways of doing it: "I," saith he, "did always, and from almost every one, receive this answer; that if either I or any other would find out the frauds and avoid the snares of upstart heretics, and continue sound and upright in the true faith, he should guard and strengthen his faith, God helping him, by these two means: viz. first, by the authority of the divine law, and then by the tradition of the Catholic Church."† And again, "We before have said that this hath always been, and is at present, the custom of Catholics, that they prove their faith by these two ways; first, by authority of the divine canon; then by the tradition of the universal Church."‡

Is it not strange that he (especially being a western man, living in those parts where the Pope had got much sway, and who doth express great reverence to the apostolic see) should omit that way of determining points, which of all (according to the modern conceits about the Pope) is most ready and most sure?

24. In like manner Tertullian professeth the Catholics in his

* P. 316. (in edit. Balus.) † P. 317. ‡ P. 364.

time to use such compendious methods of confuting heretics; "We," saith he, "when we would dispatch against heretics for the faith of the gospel, do commonly use these short ways, which do maintain both the order of times prescribing against the lateness of impostors, and the authority of the Churches patronising apostolical tradition."* But why did he skip over a more compendious way than any of those; namely, standing to the judgment of the Roman bishop?†

25. It is true that both he and St. Irenæus before him, disputing against the heretics of their times, who had introduced pernicious novelties of their own devising, when they allege the general consent of churches (planted by the Apostles, and propagated by continual successions of bishops from those whom the Apostles did ordain) in doctrines and practices opposite to those devices, as a good argument (and so indeed it then was, next to a demonstration) against them, do produce the Roman church, as a principal one among them, on several obvious accounts; and this indeed argueth the Roman Church to have been then one competent witness, or credible retainer of tradition; as also were the other apostolical Churches, to whose testimony they likewise appeal: but what is this to the Roman bishop's judicial power in such cases? why do they not urge that in plain terms? They would certainly have done so if they had known it, and thought it of any validity.

Do but mark their words, involving the force of their argumentation; "When," saith Irenæus, "we do again (after allegation of Scripture) appeal to that tradition, which is from the Apostles, which by succession of presbyters is preserved in the Churches:"‡ and, "That," saith Tertullian, "will appear to have been delivered by the Apostles, which hath been kept as holy in the apostolical churches: let us see what milk the Corinthians did draw from Paul; what the Philippians, the Thessalonians, the Ephesians do read: what also the Romans, our nearer neighbors, do say, to whom both Peter and Paul did leave the gospel sealed with their blood: we have also the churches nursed by John,"§ &c. Again, "It is therefore manifest," saith he, in his Prescriptions against Heretics, "that every doctrine which doth conspire with those apostolical churches, in which the faith originally was planted, is to be accounted true; as undoubtedly holding that which the churches did receive from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God; but all other doctrine is to be prejudged

* Tertull. in Marc. iv. 5. † Tertull. contra Hermog. cap. 1.
‡ Iren. iii. 2. § Adv. Marc. iv. 5.

false, which doth think against the truth of the churches, and of the Apostles, and of Christ, and of God."* Their argumentation then, in short, is plainly this; that the conspiring of the churches in doctrines contrary to those which the heretics vented, did irrefragably signify those doctrines to be apostolical: which discourse doth nowise favor the Roman pretences, but indeed, if we do weigh it, is very prejudicial thereto; it thereby appearing that Christian doctors then in the canvassing of points and assuring tradition had no peculiar regard to the Roman church's testimony, no deference at all to the Roman bishop's authority; (not otherwise at least than to the authority of one single bishop yielding attestation to tradition.)

26. It is odd that even old Popes themselves in elaborate tracts disputing against heretics, (as Pope Celestine against Nestorius and Pelagius, Pope Leo against Eutyches,) do content themselves to urge testimonies of Scripture, and arguments grounded thereon; not alleging their own definitive authority, or using this parlous argumentation; "I, the supreme doctor of the Church, and judge of controversies, do assert thus: and therefore you are obliged to submit your assent."

27. It is matter of amazement, if the Pope were such as they would have him to be, that in so many bulky volumes of ancient Fathers, living through many ages after Christ, in those vast treasuries of learning and knowlege, wherein all sorts of truth are displayed, all sorts of duty are pressed; this momentous point of doctrine and practice should nowhere be expressed in clear and peremptory terms: (I speak so, for that by wresting words, by impertinent application, by straining consequences, the most ridiculous positions imaginable may be deduced from their writings.)

It is strange that somewhere or other, at least incidentally, in their commentaries on the Scripture, wherein many places concerning the Church and its hierarchy do invite to speak of the Pope; in their treatises about the priesthood, about the unity and peace of the Church, about heresy and schism; in their epistles concerning ecclesiastical affairs; in their historical narrations about occurrences in the Church; in their concertations with heterodox adversaries, they should not frequently touch it, they should not sometimes largely dwell on it.

Is it not marvellous that Origen, St. Hilary, St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Austin, in their commentaries

* Tert. de Præscr. 21.

and tractates on those places of Scripture [*Tu es Petrus. Pasce oves*] whereon they now build the papal authority, should be so dull and drowsy, as not to say a word concerning the Pope?

That St. Austin, in his so many elaborate tractates against the Donatists, (wherein he discourseth so prolixly about the Church, its unity, communion, discipline,) should never insist on the duty of obedience to the Pope, or charge those schismatics with their rebellion against him, or allege his authority against them?

If we consider that the Pope was bishop of the imperial city, the metropolis of the world; that he thence was most eminent in rank, did abound in wealth, did live in great splendor and reputation; had many dependences, and great opportunities to gratify and relieve many of the clergy; that of the Fathers, whose volumes we have, all well affected towards him, divers were personally obliged to him, for his support in their distress, (as Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret;) or as to their patrons and benefactors, (as St. Jerome;) divers could not but highly respect him, as patron of the cause wherein they were engaged, (as Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen, Ambrose, Austin;) some were his partisans in a common quarrel, (as Cyril;) divers of them lived in places and times wherein he had got much sway, (as all the western bishops;) that he had then improved his authority much beyond the old limits; that all the bishops of the western or Latin churches had a peculiar dependence on him,* (especially after that by advantage of his station, by favor of the court, by color of the Sardican Canons, by voluntary deferences and submissions, by several tricks, he had wound himself to meddle in most of their chief affairs;) that hence divers bishops were tempted to admire, to court, to flatter him; that divers aspiring Popes were apt to encourage the commenders of their authority, which they themselves were apt to magnify and inculcate; considering, I say, such things, it is a wonder that in so many voluminous discourses so little should be said favoring this pretence, so nothing that proveth it, [so much that crosseth it, so much indeed, as I hope to show, that quite overthroweth it.]

If it be asked how we can prove this, I answer, that (beside who carefully peruseth those old books will easily see it) we are beholden to our adversaries for proving it to us, when they least intended us such a favor: for that no clear and cogent passages for proof of this pretence can be thence fetched, is sufficiently evident from the very allegations, which after their most dili-

* Socr. vii. 11.

gent raking in old books they produce; the which are so few, and fall so very short of their purpose, that without much stretching they signify nothing.

28. It is monstrous that in the code of the Catholic church (consisting of the decrees of so many synods, concerning ecclesiastical order and discipline) there should not be one canon directly declaring his authority; nor any mention made of him, except thrice accidentally; once on occasion of declaring the authority of the Alexandrine bishop, the other on occasion of assigning to the bishop of Constantinople the second place of honor, and equal privileges with him.*

If it be objected that these discourses are negative, and therefore of small force; I answer, that therefore they are most proper to assert such a negative proposition: for how can we otherwise better show a thing not to be, than by showing it to have no footstep there, where it is supposed to stand? How can we more clearly argue a matter of right to want proof, than by declaring it not to be extant in the laws grounding such right; not taught by the masters who profess to instruct in such things; not testified in records concerning the exercise of it? Such arguments indeed in such cases are not merely negative, but rather privative; proving things not to be, because not affirmed there, where in reason they ought to be affirmed; standing therefore on positive suppositions, that holy Scripture, that general tradition are not imperfect and lame toward their design; that ancient writers were competently intelligent, faithful, diligent; that all of them could not conspire in perpetual silence about things, of which they had often fair occasion and great reason to speak: in fine, such considerations, however they may be deluded by sophistical wits, will yet bear great sway, and often will amount near to the force of demonstration, with men of honest prudence. However we shall proceed to other discourses more direct and positive against the Popish doctrine.

II. Secondly, we shall show that this pretence, on several accounts, is contrary to the doctrine of holy Scripture.

1. This pretence doth thwart the holy Scripture, by assigning to another the prerogatives and peculiar titles appropriated therein to our Lord.

The Scripture asserteth him to be our only Sovereign Lord and King: 'To us,' saith it, 'there is one Lord;' and, 'One King shall be king over them;' who 'shall reign over the house of David for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end;'

* Conc. Nic. can. 6. Conc. Const. can. 2. Conc. Chalc. can. 28.

who is 'the only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords:' the 'one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy.'

The Scripture speaketh of one Arch-pastor, and great Shepherd of the sheep, exclusively to any other; for, 'I will,' said God in the Prophet, 'set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed the sheep;' and, 'There,' saith our Lord himself, 'shall be one fold, and one shepherd:' who that shall be he expresseth, adding, 'I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep:' (by Pope Boniface's good leave, who maketh St. Peter or himself this shepherd.*)

The Scripture telleth us that we have 'one High Priest of our profession,' answerable to that one in the Jewish Church, his type.

The Scripture informeth us that there is but one supreme Doctor, Guide, Father of Christians, prohibiting us to acknowlege any other for such; 'Ye are all brethren: and call ye not any one father on earth; for one is your Father, even he that is in heaven: neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ.' Good Pope Gregory (not the seventh of that name) did take this for a good argument; for, "What therefore, dearest brother," saith he to John of Constantinople, "wilt thou say in that terrible trial of the Judge who is coming; who dost affect to be called not only Father, but general Father in the world?"†

The Scripture representeth the Church as 'a building whereof Christ himself is the chief corner-stone;' as a family, whereof he being the *Pater-familias*, all others are fellow-servants; as one body, having one head; whom 'God hath given to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body.'

He is the one spouse of the Church; which title one would think he might leave peculiar to our Lord; there being no vice-husbands; yet hath he been bold even to claim that, as may be seen in the Constitutions of Pope Gregory X. in one of their general synods.‡

It seemeth therefore a sacrilegious arrogance (derogating from our Lord's honor) for any man to assume or admit those titles of Sovereign of the Church, Head of the Church, our Lord, Arch-pastor, Highest Priest, chief Doctor, Master, Father, Judge of Christians; on what pretence, or under what distinction soever: these pompatic, foolish, proud, perverse,

* Extrav. Com. lib. i. tit. 8. c. 1.

† Greg. M. Epist. iv. 38.

‡ Sext. Decret. lib. i. tit. vi. cap. 3. Baron. an. 34. §. 208. Vid. Greg. I. Epist. lib. iv. Ep. 32. 34. 36. 38. 39. lib. vi. Ep. 24. 28. 30. 31 lib. vii. Ep. 70.

wicked profane words; these names of singularity, elation, vanity, blasphemy, (to borrow the epithets with which Pope Gregory I. doth brand the titles of Universal Bishop, and Œcumenical Patriarch, no less modest in sound, and far more innocent in meaning, than those now ascribed to the Pope,) are therefore to be rejected; not only because they are injurious to all other pastors, and to the people of God's heritage, but because they do encroach on our only Lord, to whom they do only belong; much more to usurp the things which they do naturally signify, is a horrible invasion on our Lord's prerogative.

Thus hath that great Pope taught us to argue, in words expressly condemning some, and consequently all of them, together with the things which they signify; "What" (saith he, writing to the bishop of Constantinople, who had admitted the title of Universal Bishop or Patriarch) "wilt thou say to Christ, the head of the universal Church, in the trial of the last judgment, who by the appellation of Universal dost endeavor to subject all his members to thee? Whom, I pray, dost thou mean to imitate in so perverse a word, but him who, despising the legions of angels constituted in fellowship with him, did endeavor to break forth unto the top of singularity, that he might both be subject to none, and alone be over all? who also said, I will ascend into heaven, and will exalt my throne above the stars——for what are thy brethren, all the bishops of the universal Church, but the stars of heaven; to whom while by this haughty word thou desirest to prefer thyself, and to trample on their name in comparison to thee, what dost thou say, but, I will climb into heaven?"*

And again, in another epistle to the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, he taxeth the same patriarch for "assuming to boast so that he attempteth to ascribe all things to himself, and studieth by the elation of pompous speech to subject to himself all the members of Christ, which do cohere to one sole head, namely, to Christ."†

Again, "I confidently say, that whoever doth call himself Universal Bishop, or desireth to be so called, doth in his elation forerun Antichrist, because he pridingly doth set himself before all others."

If these argumentations be sound, or signify any thing, what is the pretence of universal sovereignty and pastorship, but a piece of Luciferian arrogance? Who can imagine that

* Greg. Ep. iv. 38. † Gr. M. Ep. iv. 36.

even this Pope could approve, could assume, could exercise it? If he did, was he not monstrously senseless, and above measure impudent, to use such discourses, which so plainly, without altering a word, might be retorted on him; which are built on suppositions, that it is unlawful and wicked to assume superiority over the Church, over all bishops, over all Christians; the which indeed (seeing never Pope was of greater repute, or did write in any case more solemnly and seriously) have given to the pretences of his successors so deadly a wound, that no balm of sophistical interpretation can be able to heal it.

We see that according to St. Gregory M. our Lord Christ is the one only head of the Church; to whom for company let us adjoin St. Basil M. (that we may have both Greek and Latin for it,) who saith, that (according to St. Paul) "we are the body of Christ, and members one of another, because it is manifest that the one and sole truly head, which is Christ, doth hold and connect each one to another unto concord."*

To decline these allegations of Scripture, they have forged distinctions, of several kinds of churches, and several sorts of heads; the which evasions I shall not particularly discourse, seeing it may suffice to observe in general, that no such distinctions have any place or any ground in Scripture, nor can well consist with it; which simply doth represent the Church as one kingdom, 'a kingdom of heaven, a kingdom not of this world;' all the subjects whereof have their πολίτευμα in heaven, or are considered as members of a city there; so that it is vain to seek for a sovereign thereof in this world: the which also doth to the Catholic church sojourning on earth usually impart the name and attributes properly appertaining to the Church most universal, (comprehensive of all Christians in heaven and on earth,) because that is a visible representative of this, and we by joining in offices of piety with that do communicate with this; whence that which is said of one (concerning the unity of its king, its head, its pastor, its priest) is to be understood of the other; especially considering that our Lord, according to his promise, is ever present with the Church here, governing it by the efficacy of his Spirit and grace, so that no other corporeal or visible head of this spiritual body is needful.†

It was to be sure a visible headship which St. Gregory did so eagerly impugn and exclaim against; for he could not ap-

* Bas. M. de Jud. Div. tom. ii. p. 261. Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 4. Vid. contra Petil. iii. 42. De Pont. R. i. 9.

† Cypr. Ep. 69.

prehend the bishop of Constantinople so wild, as to affect a jurisdiction over the Church mystical, or invisible.

2. Indeed on this very account the Romish pretence doth not well accord with holy Scripture, because it transformeth the Church into another kind of body, than it was constituted by God, according to the representation of it in Scripture: for there it is represented as a spiritual and heavenly society, compacted by the bands of one faith, one hope, one spirit of charity: but this pretence turneth it into a worldly frame; united by the same bands of interest and design; managed in the same manner, by terror and allurement; supported by the same props of force, of policy, of wealth, of reputation and splendor, as all other secular corporations are.*

You may call it what you please; but it is evident that in truth the papal monarchy is a temporal dominion, driving on worldly ends by worldly means; such as our Lord did never mean to institute: so that the subjects thereof may with far more reason, than the people of Constantinople had, when their bishop Nestorius did stop some of their priests from contradicting him, say, "We have a king; a bishop we have not:"† so that on every Pope we may charge that, whereof Anthimus was accused, in the synod of Constantinople, under Menas; "That he did account the greatness and dignity of the priesthood to be, not a spiritual charge of souls, but as a kind of politic rule."‡

This was that which seeming to be affected by the bishop of Antioch, in encroachment on the Church of Cyprus, the fathers of the Ephesine Synod did endeavor to nip; enacting a canon against all such invasions, "lest under pretext of holy discipline the pride of worldly authority should creep in."§ And what pride of that kind could they mean beyond that which now the Popes do claim and exercise?‖ Now, do I say, after that the papal empire hath swollen to such a bulk: whereas so long ago, when it was but in its bud and stripling age, it was observed of it by a very honest historian, "that the Roman episcopacy had long since advanced into a high degree of power beyond the priesthood."¶

3. This pretence doth thwart the Scripture by destroying that brotherly coordination and equality, which our Lord did appoint among the bishops and chief pastors of his Church:

* Greg. M. Ep. vii. 111. † Conc. Eph. Part. cap. 30.
‡ Conc. sub Men. Act. i. pag. 9.
§ Can. Eph. i. can. 8. ‖ Conc. Afr. ad P. Celest. 1.
¶ Socr. vii. 11.

he did (as we before showed) prohibit all his Apostles to assume any domination or authoritative superiority over one another; the which command, together with others concerning the pastoral function, we may well suppose to reach their successors: so did St. Jerome suppose, collecting thence that all bishops by original institution are equals, or that no one by our Lord's order may challenge superiority over another; "Whereever," saith he, "a bishop is, whether at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Thanis, he is of the same worth, and of the same priesthood; the power of wealth or lowness of poverty do not make a bishop higher or lower; but all are successors of the Apostles."* Where doth not he plainly deny the bishop of Eugubium to be inferior to him of Rome, as being no less a successor of the Apostles than he? Doth he not say these words in way of proof, that the authority of the Roman bishop or church was of no validity against the practice of other bishops and Churches? (on occasion of deacons there taking on them more than in other places, as cardinal deacons do now;) which excludeth such distinctions as scholastical fancies have devised, to shift off his testimony; the which he uttered simply, never dreaming of such distinctions.

This consequence St. Gregory did suppose, when he therefore did condemn the title of Universal Bishop, because it did "imply an affectation of superiority" and dignity in one bishop above others; of "abasing the name of other bishops in comparison of his own," of extolling "himself above the rest of priests,"† &c.

This the ancient Popes did remember, when usually in their compellation of any bishop they did style them brethren, colleagues, fellow-ministers, fellow-bishops,‡ not intending thereby compliment or mockery, but to declare their sense of the original equality among bishops; notwithstanding some differences in order and privileges which their see had obtained. And that this was the general sense of the Fathers we shall afterward show.

Hence, when it was objected to them that they did affect superiority, they did sometimes disclaim it: so did Pope Gelasius I.§ (a zealous man for the honor of his see.)

4. This pretence doth thwart the holy Scripture, not only by trampling down the dignity of bishops, (which according

* Hier. Ep. 85. (ad Evagr.) † Gr. Ep. iv. 34. &c.
‡ P. Corn. apud Cyp. Ep. 48.
§ P. Gelas. I. Ep. 9. (ad Euphem. Ep. CP.)

to St. Gregory doth imply great pride and presumption,) but as really infringing the rights granted by our Lord to his Church, and the governors of it.*

For to each church our Lord hath imposed a duty, and imparted a power of maintaining divine truth, and so approving itself 'a pillar and support of truth:' of deciding controversies possible and proper to be decided with due temper, ultimately without farther resort; for that he who will not obey or acquiesce in its decision, is to be 'as a heathen or publican:' of censuring and rejecting offenders; (in doctrine or demeanor;) 'These within,' saith St. Paul to the Church of Corinth, 'do not ye judge? But them that are without God judgeth: wherefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person:' of preserving order and decency, according to that rule prescribed to the Church of Corinth, 'Let all things be done decently and in order:' of promoting edification: of deciding causes.

All which rights and privileges the Roman bishop doth bereave the churches of, snatching them to himself; pretending that he is the sovereign doctor, judge, regulator of all churches; overruling and voiding all that is done by them, according to his pleasure.

The Scripture hath enjoined and empowered all bishops to feed, guide, and rule their respective churches, as the ministers, stewards, ambassadors, angels of God; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ: to whom God hath committed the care of their people, so that they are responsible for their souls.

All which rights and privileges of the episcopal office the Pope hath invaded, doth obstruct, cramp, frustrate, destroy; pretending (without any warrant) that their authority is derived from him; forcing them to exercise it no otherwise than as his subjects, and according to his pleasure.† But of this point more afterward.

5. This pretence doth thwart the Scripture, by robbing all Christian people of the liberties and rights with which by that divine charter they are endowed,‡ and which they are obliged to preserve inviolate.

St. Paul enjoineth the Galatians to 'stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and not to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage.' There is therefore a liberty which we must maintain, and a power to which we must not

* Greg. vii. 30. (p. 451.) Syn. Eph. I. can. 8.
† P. Leo I. Ep. 55. ‡ Greg. I. Ep. i. 24.

submit: and against whom can we have more ground to do this, than against him who pretendeth to dogmatise, to define points of faith, to impose doctrines (new and strange enough) on our consciences, under a peremptory obligation of yielding assent to them; to prescribe laws, as divine and necessary to be observed, without warrant, as those dogmatists did, against whom St. Paul biddeth us to maintain our liberty? (so that if he should declare virtue to be vice, and white to be black, we must believe him, some of his adherents have said, consistently enough with his pretences:) for,

Against such tyrannical invaders we are bound to maintain our liberty, according to that precept of St. Paul; the which if a Pope might well allege against the proceedings of a general synod, with much more reason may we thereby justify our non-submission to one man's exorbitant domination.

This is a power which the Apostles themselves did not challenge to themselves; for, 'We,' saith St. Paul, 'have not dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy.'

They did not pretend that any Christian should absolutely believe them in cases wherein they had not revelation (general or special) from God; in such cases referring their opinion to the judgment and discretion of Christians.

They say, 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed:' 'If any man,' &c. which precept, with many others of the like purport, (enjoining us to examine the truth, to adhere unto the received doctrine, to decline heterodoxies and novelties,) doth signify nothing, if every Christian hath not allowed to him a judgment of discretion, but is tied blindly to follow the dictates of another.

St. Austin (I am sure) did think this liberty such, that without betraying it no man could be obliged to believe any thing not grounded on canonical authority: for to a Donatist, his adversary, citing the authority of St. Cyprian against him, he thus replieth; "But now seeing it is not canonical which thou recitest, with that liberty to which the Lord hath called us, I do not receive the opinion, differing from Scripture, of that man whose praise I cannot reach, to whose great learning I do not compare my writings, whose wit I love, in whose speech I delight, whose charity I admire, whose martyrdom I reverence."*

This liberty, not only the ancients, but even divers Popes have acknowleged to belong to every Christian; as we shall

* Aug. contr. Cresc. ii. 32.

hereafter show, when we shall prove that we may lawfully reject the Pope, as a patron of error and iniquity.

6. It particularly doth thwart Scripture by wronging princes, in exempting a numerous sort of people from subjection to their laws and judicature; whereas by God's ordination and express command every soul is subject to them; not excepting the Popes themselves; (in the opinion of St. Chrysostom, except they be greater than any Apostle.)

By pretending to govern the subjects of princes without their leave; to make laws without his permission or confirmation; to cite his subjects out of their territories, &c. which are encroachments on the rights of God's unquestionable ministers.

III. Farther, because our adversaries do little regard any allegation of Scripture against them, (pretending themselves to be the only masters of its sense, or of common sense, judges and interpreters of them,) we do allege against them that this pretence doth also cross tradition, and the common doctrine of the Fathers. For,

1. Common usage and practice is a good interpreter of right; and that showeth no such right was known in the primitive Church.

2. Indeed the state of the primitive Church did not admit it.

3. The Fathers did suppose no order in the Church, by original right, or divine institution, superior to that of a bishop; whence they commonly did style a bishop the highest priest, and episcopacy the top of ecclesiastical orders.*

"The chief priest," saith Tertullian, "that is, the bishop, hath the right of giving baptism."†

"Although," saith St. Ambrose, "the presbyters also do it, yet the beginning of the ministry is from the highest priest."‡

Optatus calleth bishops "the tops and princes of all."§

"The divine order of bishops," saith Dionysius, "is the first of divine orders; the same being also the extreme and last of them; for into it all the frame of our hierarchy is resolved and accomplished."‖

This language is common even among Popes themselves, complying with the speech then current; for, "Presbyters," saith Pope Innocent I. "although they are priests, yet have they not the top of high-priesthood."¶

"No man," saith Pope Zosimus I. "against the precepts of

* Const. Apost. viii. 46. † Tert. de Bapt. cap. 17.
‡ Ambr. de Sacr. iii. 1. Id. Ep. 5. § Opt. 1. &c.
‖ Isid. Hisp. apud Grat. Dist. xxi. cap. 1.
¶ P. Innoc. I. Ep. 1. (ad Decent.) Ep. 12. (ad Aurel.)

the Fathers, should presume to aspire to the highest priesthood of the Church."*

"It is decreed," saith Pope Leo I. "that the chorepiscopi, or presbyters, who figure the sons of Aaron, shall not presume to snatch that which the princes of the priests (whom Moses and Aaron did typify) are commanded to do."† (Note, by the way, that seeing according to this Pope's mind (after St. Jerome) Moses and Aaron did in the Jewish policy represent bishops, there was none there to prefigure the Pope.)

In those days the bishop of Nazianzum (a petty town in Cappadocia) was an high-priest, (so Gregory calleth his father.‡) And the bishop of a poor city in Afric is styled "Sovereign Pontiff of Christ, most blessed Father, most blessed Pope;"§ and the very Roman clergy doth call St. Cyprian "most blessed and most glorious Pope:"‖ which titles the Pope doth now so charily reserve and appropriate to himself.

But innumerable instances of this kind might be produced: I shall only therefore add two other passages, which seem very observable, to the enforcement of this discourse.

St. Jerome, reprehending the discipline of the Montanists, hath these words; "With us the bishops do hold the places of the Apostles; with them, a bishop is in the third place: for they have for the first rank the patriarchs of Pepusa in Phrygia; for the second, those whom they call cenones; so are bishops thrust down into the third, that is, almost the last place; as if thence religion became more stately, if that which is first with us be the last with them."¶ Now doth not St. Jerome here affirm that every bishop hath the place of an Apostle, and the first rank in the Church? Doth not he tax the advancement of any order above this? May not the popish hierarchy most patly be compared to that of the Montanists, and is it not equally liable to the censure of St. Jerome? Doth it not place the Roman Pope in the first place, and the cardinals in the second, detruding the bishops into a third place? Could the Pepusian patriarch, or his cenones, either more overtop in dignity, or sway by power over bishops, than doth the Roman patriarch and his cardinals?

Again, St. Cyprian telleth Pope Cornelius, that in episcopacy doth reside "the sublime and divine power of govern-

* P. Zos. I. Ep. 1. (ad Hesych.) † P. Leo. Ep. 88. &c.

‡ Apost. Const. viii. 10. 12.

§ (Paulin. apud Aug. Ep. 36.) Aug. Ep. 35. Hieron. (Aug. Ep. 11 13. 14. &c.)

‖ Ep. 31. ¶ Hier. (ad Marcellam) Ep. 54.

ing the Church;" it being "the sublime top of the priesthood."* "He," saith the blessed man concerning Pope Cornelius, "did not suddenly arrive to episcopacy; but being through all ecclesiastical offices promoted, and having in divine administrations often merited of God, did by all the steps of religion mount to the sublimest pitch of priesthood."† Where it is visible that St. Cyprian doth not reckon the papacy, but the episcopacy of Cornelius to be that top of priesthood, (above which there was nothing eminent in the Church,) unto which he passing through the inferior degrees of the clergy had attained.

In fine, it cannot well be conceived that the ancients constantly would have spoken in this manner, if they had allowed the papal office to be such as now it doth bear itself; the which indeed is an order no less distant from episcopacy, than the rank of a king differeth from that of the meanest baron in his kingdom.

Neither is it prejudicial to this discourse, (or to any preceding,) that in the primitive Church there were some distinctions and subordinations of bishops, (as of patriarchs, primates, metropolitans, common bishops,) for,

These were according to prudence constituted by the Church itself for the more orderly and peaceable administration of things.

These did not import such a difference among the bishops, that one should domineer over others, to the infringing of primitive fraternity, or common liberty: but a precedence in the same rank, with some moderate advantages for the common good.

These did stand under authority of the Church; and might be changed or corrected, as was found expedient, by common agreement.

By virtue of these the superiors of this kind could do nothing over their subordinates in an arbitrary manner, but according to the regulation of canons, established by consent in synods; by which their influence was amplified or curbed.‡

When any of these did begin to domineer, or exceed his limits, he was liable to account and correction; he was exclaimed against as tyrannical.§

When primates did begin to swell and encroach, good men declared their displeasure at it, and wished it removed; as

* Cypr. Ep. 55. (ad P. Cornel.) † Cypr. Ep. 52.

‡ Conc. Ant. can. 9. Vid. Apost. can. 34. Conc. Carth. apud Cypr. Cod. Afr. can. 39. Nestorius, Dioscorus.

§ Euseb. viii. 1.

is known particularly by "the famous wish of Gregory Nazianzen.*

But we are discoursing against a superiority of a different nature, which foundeth itself in the institution of Christ, imposeth itself on the Church, is not alterable or governable by it, can endure no check or control, pretendeth to be endowed with an absolute power to act without or against the consent of the Church, is limited by no certain bounds but its own pleasure,† &c.

IV. Farther, this pretence may be impugned by many arguments springing from the nature and reason of things abstractedly considered; according to which the exercise of such an authority may appear unpracticable, without much iniquity, and great inconvenience, in prejudice to the rights of Christian states and people, to the interests of religion and piety, to the peace and welfare of mankind: whence it is to be rejected as a pest of Christendom.

1. Whereas all the world in design and obligation is Christian, (the utmost parts of the earth being granted in possession to our Lord; and his gospel extending to every creature under heaven,) and may in effect become such, when God pleaseth, by acceptance of the gospel; whereas it may easily happen that the most distant places on the earth may embrace Christianity; whereas really Christian churches have been and are dispersed all about the world; it is thence hugely incommodious that all the Church should depend on an authority resident in one place, and to be managed by one person: the Church being such, is too immense, boundless, uncircumscribed, unwieldy a bulk, to be guided by the inspection, or managed by the influence of one such authority or person.

If the whole world were reduced under the government of one civil monarch, it would necessarily be ill governed, as to policy, to justice, to peace: the skirts or remoter parts from the metropolis or centre of the government, would extremely suffer thereby; for they would feel little light or warmth from majesty shining at such a distance: they would live under small awe of that power, which was so far out of sight: they must have very difficult recourse to it, for redress of grievances, and relief of oppressions; for final decision of causes, and composure of differences; for correction of offences, and dispensation of

* Greg. Naz. Orat. 28.

† So Socrates of the bishop (not only of Rome, but) Alexandria. Lib. vii. cap. 11.

So St. Chrysostom in 1 Tim. iii. 1. in Ep. Orat. 11.

So Greg. Naz. complained of τυραννικὴ πρυνομία. Ibid.

justice, on good information, with tolerable expedition: it would be hard to preserve peace, or quell seditions, and suppress insurrections, that might arise in distant quarters.

What man could obtain the knowlege or experience needful skilfully and justly to give laws or administer judgment to so many nations different in humor, in language, in customs? What mind of man, what industry, what leisure could serve to sustain the burden of that care, which is needful to the wielding such an office? How and when should one man be able to receive all the addresses, to weigh all the cases, to make all the resolutions and dispatches requisite for such a charge? If the burden of one small kingdom be so great, that wise and good princes do groan under its weight, what must that be of all mankind? To such an extent of government there must be allowed a majesty, and power correspondent, the which cannot be committed to one hand, without its degeneration into extreme tyranny. The words of Zosimus to this purpose are observable; who saith that the Romans, by admitting Augustus Cæsar to the government, did so very perilously; for, "If he should choose to manage the government rightly and justly, he would not be capable of applying himself to all things as were fit, not being able to succor those who do lie at greatest distance; nor could he find so many magistrates, as would not be ashamed to defeat the opinion conceived of them; nor could he suit them to the differences of so many manners: or, if transgressing the bounds of royalty, he should warp to tyranny, disturbing the magistracies, overlooking misdemeanors, bartering right for money, holding the subjects for slaves, (such as most emperors, or rather near all have been, few excepted;) then it is quite necessary that the brutish authority of the prince should be a public calamity: for then flatterers being by him dignified with gifts and honors do invade the greatest commands; and those who are modest and quiet, not affecting the same life with them, are consequently displeased, not enjoying the same advantages; so that from hence cities are filled with seditions and troubles. And the civil and military employments being delivered up to avaricious persons, do both render a peaceable life sad and grievous to men of better disposition, and do enfeeble the resolution of soldiers in war."*

Hence St. Austin was of opinion that "it were happy for mankind, if all kingdoms were small, enjoying a peaceful neighborhood."†

* Zos. Hist. i. (p. 4. Steph.)

† Aug. de Civ. D. iv. 15. Arist. Pol. vii. 4.

It is commonly observed by historians, that "Rome growing in bigness, did labor therewith,"* and was not able to support itself; many distempers and disorders springing up in so vast a body, which did throw it into continual pangs, and at length did bring it to ruin; for, "Then," saith St. Austin concerning the times of Pompey, "Rome had subdued Afric, it had subdued Greece; and widely also ruling over other parts, as not able to bear itself, did in a manner by its own greatness break itself."†

Hence that wise prince, Augustus Cæsar, did himself forbear to enlarge the Roman dominion, and did in his testament advise the senate to do the like.‡

To the like inconveniences (and much greater in its kind; temporal things being more easily ordered than spiritual, and having secular authority, great advantages of power and wealth, to aid itself) must the Church be obnoxious, if it were subjected to the government of one sovereign, unto whom the maintenance of faith, the protection of discipline, the determination of controversies, the revision of judgments, the discussion and final decision of causes on appeal, the suppression of disorders and factions, the inspection over all governors, the correction of misdemeanors, the constitution, relaxation and abolition of laws, the resolution of all matters concerning religion and the public state, in all countries must be referred.

Τίς πρὸς ταῦτα ἱκανός; What shoulders can bear such a charge without perpetual miracle? (and yet we do not find that the Pope hath any promise of miraculous assistance, nor in his demeanor doth appear any mark thereof.) What mind would not the care of so many affairs utterly distract and overwhelm? Who could find time to cast a glance on each of so numberless particulars? What sagacity of wit, what variety of learning, what penetrancy of judgment, what strength of memory, what indefatigable vigor of industry, what abundance of experience would suffice, for enabling one man to weigh exactly all the controversies of faith and cases of discipline perpetually starting up in so many regions?

What reach of skill and ability would serve for accommodation of laws to the different humors and fashions of so many nations? Shall a decrepit old man, in the decay of his age, parts, vigor, (such as Popes usually are,) undertake this? May we not say to him, as Jethro did to Moses, *Ultra vires tuas*

* Suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit. Hor. Ep. 16.
† Aug. de Civ. D. xviii. 45. Tac. Hist. ii p. 476.
‡ Dion. lib. lvi. Tac. Ann. 1. Claud. de Bello Gildon.

est negotium; 'The thing thou doest is not good: thou wilt surely wear away, both thou and this people that is with thee: for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone.'

If the care of a small diocese hath made the most able and industrious bishops (who had a conscience and sense of their duty) to groan under its weight, how insupportable must such a charge be!

The care of his own particular church, if he would act the part of a bishop indeed, would sufficiently take up the Pope; especially in some times; whenas Pope Alexander saith,—— *Ut intestina nostræ specialis ecclesiæ negotia vix possemus ventilare, nedum longinqua ad plenum extricare.**

If it be said that St. Paul testifieth of himself, that he had 'a care of all the churches' incumbent on him; I answer, that he (and other Apostles had the like) questionless had a pious solicitude for the welfare of all Christians, especially of the churches which he had founded, being vigilant for occasions to edify them. But what is this, to bearing the charge of a standing government over all the churches diffused through the world? That care of a few churches then was burdensome to him: what is the charge of so many now; to one seldom endowed with such apostolical graces and gifts as St. Paul was?

How weak must the influence of such an authority be on the circumferential parts of its œcumenical sphere!

How must the outward branches of the churches faint and fade for want of sap from the root of discipline, which must be conveyed through so many obstructions to such a distance!

How discomposed must things be in each country, for want of seasonable resolution, hanging in suspense, till information do travel to Rome, and determination come back thence!

How difficult, how impossible will it be for him there to receive faithful information or competent testimony, whereon to ground just decisions of causes!

How will it be in the power thence of any malicious and cunning person to raise trouble against innocent persons! for any like person to decline the due correction laid on him, by transferring the cause from home to such a distance!

How much cost, how much trouble, how much hazard must parties concerned be at to fetch light and justice thence!

Put case a heresy, a schism, a doubt or debate of great moment should arise in China; how should the gentleman in Italy proceed to confute that heresy, to quash that schism, to

* P. Alex. II. (Epist. ad Ger. Rhem. Bin. p. 284.)

satisfy that doubt, to determine that cause? how long must it be, ere he can have notice thereof? to how many cross accidents of weather and way must the transmitting of information be subject? how difficult will it prove, to get a clear and sure knowlege concerning the state of things?

How hard will it be to get the opposite parties to appear, so as to confront testimonies and probations requisite to a fair and just decision! how shall witnesses of infirm sex or age ramble so far? how easily will some of them prepossess and abuse him with false suggestions and misrepresentations of the case! how slippery therefore will the result be, and how prone he to award a wrongful sentence!

How tedious, how expensive, how troublesome, how vexatious, how hazardous must this course be to all parties! Certainly causes must needs proceed slowly, and depend long; and in the end the resolution of them must be very uncertain.

What temptation will it be for any one (how justly soever corrected by his immediate superiors) to complain; hoping thereby to escape, to disguise the truth, &c. who being condemned will not appeal to one at a distance, hoping by false suggestions to delude him?

This necessarily will destroy all discipline, and induce impunity, or frustration of justice.

Certainly much more convenient and equal it should be, that there should be near at hand a sovereign power, fully capable, expeditely and seasonably to compose differences, to decide causes, to resolve doubts, to settle things, without more stir and trouble.

Very equal it is, that laws should rather be framed, interpreted, and executed in every country, with accommodation to the tempers of the people, to the circumstances of things, to the civil state there, by persons acquainted with those particulars, than by strangers ignorant of them, and apt to mistake about them.

How often will the Pope be imposed on, as he was in the case of Basilides, of whom St. Crypian saith, "Going to Rome he deceived our colleague Stephen, being placed at distance, and ignorant of the fact, and concealed truth, aspiring to be unjustly restored to the bishopric, from which he was justly removed."*

As he was in the case of Marcellus, who gulled Pope Julius by fair professions, as St. Basil doth often complain.†

* Cypr. Ep. 67. † Basil. Ep. 10.

As he was in aiding that versatile and troublesome bishop, Eustathius of Sebastia, to the recovery of his bishopric.

As he was in rejecting "the man of God, and most admirable bishop, Meletius;"* and admitting scandalous reports about him, which the same saint doth often resent; blaming sometimes the fallacious misinformation, sometimes the wilful presumption, negligence, pride of the Roman church, in the case.

As he was in the case of Pelagius and Celestius, who did cajole Pope Zosimus† to acquit them, to condemn Eros and Lazarus their accusers, to reprove the African bishops for prosecuting them.

How many proceedings should we have like to that of Pope Zosimus I. concerning that scandalous priest, Apiarius; whom being for grievous crimes excommunicated by his bishop, that Pope did admit to communion, and undertake to patronise; but was baffled in his enterprise.

This hath been the sense of the Fathers in the case.

St. Cyprian therefore saith, that "seeing it was a general statute among the bishops, and that it was both equal and just, that every one's cause should be heard there, where the crime was committed; and that each pastor had a portion of the flock allotted to him, which he should rule and govern, being to render unto the Lord an account of his doing." ‡

St. Chrysostom thought it "improper that one out of Egypt should administer justice to persons in Thrace."§ (And why not, as well as one out of Italy?)

The African synod thought "the Nicene Fathers had provided most prudently and most justly, that all affairs should be finally determined there where they did arise."||

They thought "a transmarine judgment could not be firm," because "the necessary persons for testimony, for the infirmity of sex or age, or for many other infirmities, could not be brought thither."¶

Pope Leo himself saw how dilatory this course would be; and that "longinquity of region doth cause the examination of truth to become over dilatory."**

Pope Liberius for such reasons did request Constantius that Athanasius's cause should be tried at Alexandria; where—"he," saith he, "that is accused, and the accusers are, and the

* Bas. Ep. 349. † P. Zos. I. Ep. 3. 4.
‡ Ep. lv. (p. 116.) § Chrys. Ep. 102. (ad P. Innoc. I.)
|| Ep. Conc. Afric. ad P. Celest. I. (in fine Cod. Afric.) vel apud Dion. Exig.
¶ Ibid. ** P. Leo I. Ep. 34.

defender of them; and so we may, on examination had, agree in our sentence about them."*

Therefore divers ancient canons of synods did prohibit that any causes should be removed out of the bounds of provinces or dioceses: as otherwhere we show.†

2. Such an authority as this pretence claimeth, must necessarily (if not withheld by continual miracle) throw the Church into sad bondage. All the world must become slaves to one city, its wealth must be derived thither, its quiet must depend on it. For it (not being restrained within any bounds of place or time, having no check on it of equal or coordinate power, standing on divine institution, and therefore immutably settled) must of its own nature become absolute and unlimited.‡

Let it be however of right limited by divine laws or human canons, yet will it be continually encroaching and stretching its power, until it grows enormous and boundless. It will not endure to be pinched by any restraint. It will draw to itself the collation of all preferments, &c.

It will assume all things to itself, trampling down all opposite claims of right and liberty; so that neither pastor nor people shall enjoy or do any thing otherwise than in dependence on it, and at its pleasure.

It will be always forging new prerogatives, and interpreting all things in favor of them, and enacting sanctions to establish them; which none must presume to contest §

It will draw to itself the disposal of all places; the exaction of goods. All princes must become his ministers, and executors of his decrees.

It will mount above all law and rule: not only challenging to be uncontrollable and unaccountable, but not enduring any reproof of its proceedings, or contradiction of its dictates: a blind faith must be yielded to all its assertions, as infallibly true; and a blind obedience to all its decrees, as unquestionably holy: whosoever shall anywise cross it in word or deed, shall certainly be discountenanced, condemned, ejected from the Church; || so that the most absolute tyranny that can be imagined will ensue: all the world hath groaned and heavily complained of their exactions, particularly our poor nation; it would raise indignation in any man to read the complaints.

* Theod. ii. 16. † Vid. Conc. Bas. Sess. xxxi. (p. 86.)

‡ Vid. Hist. Conc. Trid. p. 61.

§ P. Steph. apud Grat. Caus. 9. qu. iii. cap. 20.

|| Greg. IV. (Dist. xix. cap. 5.) Bonif. VIII. Extrav. Com. i. 8. 1.

This is consequent on such a pretence, according to the very nature of things; and so in experience it hath happened. For,

It is evident that the papacy hath devoured all the privileges and rights of all orders in the Church, either granted by God, or established in the ancient canons.*

The royalties of Peter are become immense; and consistently to his practice, the Pope doth allow men to tell him to his face, that all power in heaven and in earth is given unto him.

It belongeth to him "to judge of the whole Church."†

He hath a plenitude (as he calleth it) of power,‡ by which he can infringe any law, or do any thing that he pleaseth.

It is the tenor of his bulls, "that whoever rashly dareth to thwart his will shall incur the indignation of Almighty God, and (as if that were not enough) of St. Peter and St. Paul, also."

"No man must presume to tax his faults, or to judge of his judgment."§

"It is idolatry to disobey his commands,"‖ against their own sovereign Lord.

There are who dare in plain terms call him omnipotent, and who ascribe infinite power to him. And that he is infallible is the most common and plausible opinion: so that at Rome the contrary "is erroneous, and within an inch of being heretical."¶

We are now told that "if the Pope should err by enjoining vices or forbidding virtues, the Church should be bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues evil, unless it would sin against conscience."**

The greatest princes must stoop to his will; otherwise he hath power to cashier and depose them.

Now what greater inconvenience, what more horrible iniquity, can there be, than that all God's people (that free people, who are called to freedom) should be subject to so intolerable a yoke and miserable a slavery?

* An. Sylv. de Gestis Syn. Bas. lib. i.

† Conc. Lat. v. Sess. 11. p. 129. De omni Ecclesia jus habet judicandi. (P. Gelas. Grat. Caus. ix. q. 3. cap. 18.)

‡ Greg. Decret. lib. iii. tit. 8. cap. 4.

§ Grat. Dist. xl. cap. 6. (Si Papa—) Caus. ix. qu. 3. cap. 10.

‖ Greg. VII. Ep. iv. 2. Greg. IV. apud Grat. Dist. xix. cap. 5.

¶ Bell. de P. iv. 2.

** Bell. de Pont. iv. 5.

That tyranny soon had crept into the Roman Church Socrates telleth us.*

They have rendered true that definition of Scioppius: "The Church is a stall, or herd, or multitude of beasts, or asses."†

"They bridle us, they harness us, they spur us, they lay yokes and laws on us."‡

The greatest tyranny that ever was invented in the world is the pretence of infallibility; for Dionysius and Phalaris did leave the mind free, (pretending only to dispose of body and goods according to their will:) but the Pope, not content to make us do and say what he pleaseth, will have us also to think so; denouncing his imprecations and spiritual menaces, if we do not.

3. Such an authority will inevitably produce a depravation of Christian doctrine, by distorting it in accommodation of it to the promoting its designs and interests. It will blend Christianity with worldly notions and policies.

It certainly will introduce new doctrines, and interpret the old ones so as may serve to the advancement of the power, reputation, pomp, wealth, and pleasure of those who manage it, and of their dependents.

That which is called καπηλεύειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, to make a trade of religion will be the great work of the teachers of the Church. It will turn all divines into mercenary, slavish, designing flatterers.§

This we see come to pass, Christianity by the Papal influence being from its original simplicity transformed into quite another thing than it was; from a divine philosophy designed to improve the reason, to moderate the passions, to correct the manners of men, to prepare men for conversation with God and angels; modelled to a system of politic devices, (of notions, of precepts, of rites,) serving to exalt and enrich the Pope with his court and adherents, clients and vassals.

What doctrine of Christian theology, as it is interpreted by their schools, hath not a direct aspect, or doth not squint that way? especially according to the opinions passant and in vogue among them.

To pass over those concerning the Pope, (his universal pastorship, judgeship in controversies, power to call councils, presidency in them, superiority over them; right to confirm or annul them; his infallibility; his double sword, and dominion

* Card. Zab. de Sch. Innoc. VII. p. 560.
† Eccl. cap. 47. ‡ Ibid.
§ 1 Tim. vi. 5. 1 Thess. ii. 5. Eph. iv. 14.

(direct or indirect) over princes; his dispensing in laws, in oath, in vows, in matrimonial cases, with all other the monstrous prerogatives, which the sound doctors of Rome, with encouragement of that chair, do teach.)

What doth the doctrine concerning the exempting of the clergy from secular jurisdiction, and immunity of their goods from taxes signify, but their intire dependence on the Pope, and their being closely tied to his interests?

What is the exemption of monastical places from the jurisdiction of bishops, but listing so many soldiers and advocates to defend and advance the Papal empire?

What meaneth the doctrine concerning that middle region of souls, or cloister of purgatory, whereof the Pope holdeth the keys; opening and shutting it at his pleasure, by dispensation of pardons and indulgences; but that he must be master of the people's condition, and of their purse?

What meaneth the treasure of merits and supererogatory works, whereof he is the steward, but a way of driving a trade, and drawing money from simple people, to his treasury?

Whither doth the entangling of folks in perpetual vows tend, but to assure them in a slavish dependence on their interests, eternally, without evasion or remedy; except by favorable dispensation from the Pope?

Why is the *opus operatum* in sacraments taught to confer grace, but to breed a high opinion of the priest, and all he doth?

Whence did the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation (urged with so furious zeal) issue, but from design to magnify the credit of those, who by saying of a few words can make our God and Saviour? and withal to exercise a notable instance of their power over men, in making them to renounce their reason and senses?

Whither doth tend the doctrine concerning the mass being a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead, but to engage men to leave in their wills good sums to offer in their behalf?

Why is the cup withholden from the laity, but to lay it low, by so notable a distinction, in the principal mystery of our religion, from the priesthood?

Why is saying private mass (or celebrating the communion in solitude) allowed, but because priests are paid for it, and live by it?

At what doth the doctrine concerning the necessity of auricular confession aim, but that thereby the priests may have a mighty awe on the consciences of all people, may dive into their secrets, may manage their lives as they please?

And what doth a like necessary particular absolution intend, but to set the priest in a lofty state of authority above the people, as a judge of his condition and dispenser of his salvation?

Why do they equal ecclesiastical traditions with Scripture, but that on the pretence of them they may obtrude whatever doctrines advantageous to their designs?

What drift hath the doctrine concerning the infallibility of churches or councils, but that when opportunity doth invite, he may call a company of bishops together, to establish what he liketh, which ever after must pass for certain truth, to be contradicted by none; so enslaving the minds of all men to his dictates, which always suit to his interest.

What doth the prohibition of holy Scripture drive at, but a monopoly of knowlege to themselves, or a detaining of people in ignorance of truth and duty; so that they must be forced to rely on them for direction, must believe all they say, and blindly submit to their dictates; being disabled to detect their errors, or contest their opinions?

Why must the sacraments be celebrated, and public devotions exercised, in an unknown tongue, but that the priests may seem to have a peculiar interest in them, and ability for them?

Why must the priesthood be so indispensably forbidden marriage, but that it may be wholly untacked from the state, and rest addicted to him, and governable by him; that the persons and wealth of priests may be purely at his devotion?

To what end is the clogging religion by multiplication of ceremonies and formalities, but to amuse the people, and maintain in them a blind reverence toward the interpreters of the dark mysteries couched in them; and by seeming to encourage an exterior show of piety (or form of godliness) to gain reputation and advantage, whereby they might oppress the interior virtue and reality of it, as the Scribes and Pharisees did, although with less designs?

Why is the veneration of images and relics, the credence of miracles and legends, the undertaking of pilgrimages and voyages to Rome, and other places, more holy than ordinary; sprinklings of holy water, consecrations of baubles, (with innumerable foppish knacks and trinkets,) so cherished; but to keep the people in a slavish credulity and dotage, apt to be led by them whither they please, by any sleeveless pretence, and in the meanwhile to pick various gains from them by such trade?

What do all such things mean, but obscuring the native simplicity of Christianity, whereas it being represented intelligible to all men, would derogate from that high admiration, which these men pretend to from their peculiar and profound wisdom?

And what would men spend for these toys, if they understood they might be good Christians, and get to heaven without them?

What doth all that pomp of religion serve for, but for ostentation of the dignity of those who administer it? It may be pretended for the honor of religion, but it really conduceth to the glory of the priesthood, who shine in those pageantries.

Why is monkery (although so very different from that which was in the ancient times) so cried up as a superlative state of perfection, but that it filleth all places with swarms of lusty people, who are vowed servants to him, and have little else to do but to advance his authority, by which they subsist in that dronish way of life?

In fine, perusing the controversies of Bellarmine, or any other champion of Romanism, do but consider the nature and scope of each doctrine maintained by them; and you may easily discern that scarce any of them but doth tend to advance the interest of the Pope, or of his sworn vassals.

Whereas indeed our Lord had never any such design, to set up a sort of men in such distance above their brethren; to perk over them, and suck them of their goods by tricks; it only did charge people to allow their pastors a competent maintenance for a sober life, with a moderate respect, as was needful for the common benefit of God's people; whom they were, with humility and meekness, to instruct and guide in the plain and simple way of piety.

This is a grievous inconvenience; there being nothing wherein the Church is more concerned, than in the preservation of its doctrine pure and incorrupt from the leaven of hurtful errors, influential on practice.

4. The errors in doctrine, and miscarriages in practice, which this authority in favor to itself would introduce, would be established immovably, to the irrecoverable oppression of truth and piety; any reformation becoming impossible, while it standeth, or so far as it shall be able to oppose and obstruct it.

While particular churches do retain their liberty, and pastors their original coordination in any measure, if any church or bishop shall offer to broach any novel doctrine or practice of bad import, the others may endeavor to stop the settlement or progress of them; each church at least may keep itself sound from contagion.

But when all churches and bishops are reduced into subjection to one head, supported by the guards of his authority, who will dare to contest, or be able to withstand, what he shall say or do? It will then be deemed high presumption, contumacy, rebellion, to dissent from his determinations, how false soever,

or tax the practices countenanced by him, however irregular and culpable.

He will assume to himself the privilege not to be crossed in any thing; and soon will claim "infallibility, the mother of incorrigibility."

No error can be so palpable, which that authority will not protect and shroud from confutation; no practice so enormous, which it will not palliate, and guard from reproof.

There will be legions of mercenary tongues to speak, and stipendiary pens to write in defence of its doctrines and practices; so that whoever will undertake to oppose it shall be voted down and overwhelmed with noise, and shall incur all the discouragement and persecution imaginable. So poor truth will become utterly defenceless, wretched virtue destitute of succor or patronage.

This is so in speculation, and we see it confirmed by experience: for when from the influence of this power (as Pope Adrian VI. did ingenuously confess) an apparent degeneracy in doctrine, in discipline, in practice had seized on Christendom, all the world feeling it, and crying out loudly for reformation, yet how stiff a repugnance did the adherents to this interest make thereto! with what industry and craft did Popes endeavor to decline all means of remedy!*

What will not this party do rather than acknowlege themselves mistaken or liable to error? what palliations, what shifts do not they use? what evidence of light do they not outface?

5. The same will induce a general corruption of manners.

For the chief clergy partaking of its growth, and protected by its interest, (reciprocally supporting it, and being sheltered by it from any curb or control,) will swell into great pride and haughtiness; will be tempted to scrape and hoard up wealth, by rapine, extortion, simony; will come to enjoy ease and sloth; will be immersed in sensuality and luxury, and will consequently neglect their charge.

The inferiors will become enamored and ambitious of such dignity, and will use all means and arts to attain it.

Thence emulation, discord, sycophantry will spring.

Thence all ecclesiastical offices will become venal; to be purchased by bribes, flattery, favor.—

The higher ranks will become fastuous, supercilious, and domineering. The lower will basely crouch, cog.—

* Sleid. lib. iv p. 82. lib. xii. p. 322. Hist. Conc. Trid. p. 24. Vid. Riv. in Castig. Nol. p. 525.

What then must the people be, the guides being such?

Were such guides like to edify the people by their doctrine? Were they not like to damnify them by their example?

That thus it hath happened experience doth show, and history doth abundantly testify. This was soon observed by a Pagan historian, Am. Marcellin. By St. Basil, ὄφρυς δυτική.

What mischief this, what scandal to religion, what detriment to the Church, what ruins of souls it produceth, is visible.

The descriptions of Rome and of that Church, by Mantuan, do in a lively manner represent the great degeneracy and corruptions of it.

6. This authority, as it would induce corruption of manners, so it would perpetuate it; and render the state of things incorrigible.

For this head of the Church, and the supporters of his authority, will often need reformation, but never will endure it.

That will happen of any Pope, which the fathers of Basil complained of in Pope Eugenius.*

If the Pope would, (as Pope Adrian VI.†) yet he will not be able to reform; the interests of his dependents crossing it.

If there hath happened a good Pope, who desired to reform; yet he hath been ridiculous when he endeavored it; and found it impossible to reform even a few particulars in his own house, the incorrigible Roman court.

The nature and pretended foundation of this spiritual authority doth encourage it with insuperable obstinacy to withstand all reformation: for whereas if any temporal power doth grow intolerable, God's providence by wars and revolutions of state may dispense a redress, they have prevented this, by supposing that in this case God hath tied his own hands; this authority being immovably fixed in the same hands, from which no revolution can take it: whence from its exorbitances there can be no rescue or relief.

7. This authority will spoil him in whom it is seated; corrupting his mind and manners; rendering him a scandal to religion, and a pernicious instrument of wickedness, by the influence of his example?

To this an uncontrollable power (bridled with no restraint) and impunity doth naturally tend, and accordingly hath it been——.

* Conc. Bas. Sess. xxiii. (p. 76.) Sess. xxxi. p. 89.

† Vid. Conc. Trid. p. 22.

How many notorious reprobates, monsters of wickedness, have been in that see!*

If we survey the lives of the Popes, written by historians most indifferent, or (as most have been) partial in favor to them, we shall find, at first good ones, martyrs, confessors, saints: but after this exorbitant power had grown, how few good ones! how many extremely bad! The first Popes before Constantine were holy men: the next were tolerable, while the papacy kept within bounds of modesty: but when they having shaken off their master, and renounced allegiance to the emperor, (that is, after Gregory II.) few tolerable; generally they were either rake-hells, or intolerably arrogant, insolent, turbulent, and ravenous.

Bellarmine and Baronius do bob off this, by telling us that hence the providence of God is most apparent.†

But do they call this preserving the Church; the permission of it to continue so long in such a condition, under the prevalence of such mischiefs? when hath God deserted any people, if not then, when such impiety more than Pagan doth reign in it?

But what in the mean time became of those souls, which by this means were ruined? what amends for the vast damage which religion sustained? for the introducing so pernicious customs hardly to be extirpated?——

To what a pass of shameless wickedness must things have come, when such men as Alexander VI. having visibly such an impure brood, should be placed in this chair!

Even after the reformation began to curb their impudence, and render them more wary, yet had they the face to set Paul the third there.

How unfit must such men be, to be the guides of all Christendom; to breathe oracles of truth, to enact laws of sanctity!

How improper were those vessels of Satan to be organs of that 'holy spirit of discipline, which will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding, and will not abide where unrighteousness cometh in!'

It will engage the Pope to make the ecclesiastical authority an engine of advancing the temporal concerns of his own relations, (his sons, his nephews.)

* Vid. Dist. xl. cap. 6. (hujus culpas, etsi.) Vid. Alv. Pelag. apud Riv. Cath. Orth. p. 141. Baron. Baron. ann. 912. §. 8.

† Baron. ann. 897. §. 5.

What indeed is the Popedom now, but a ladder for a family to mount unto great estate ?*

What is it, but introducing an old man into a place, by advantage whereof a family must make hay while the sun shines ?†

8. This pretence, on divers obvious accounts, is apt to create great mischief in the world, to the disturbance of civil societies, and destruction or debilitation of temporal authority, which is certainly God's ordinance, and necessary to the well being of mankind; so that supposing it, we may in vain 'pray for kings, and all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.'

For suppose the two powers (spiritual and temporal) to be coordinate, and independent each of other; then must all Christians be put into that perplexed state of repugnant and incompatible obligations, concerning which our Lord saith, 'No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other.'

They will often draw several ways, and clash in their designs, in their laws, in their decisions; one willing and commanding that which the other disliketh and prohibiteth.

It will be impossible by any certain bounds to distinguish their jurisdiction, so as to prevent contest between them; all temporal matters being in some respect spiritual, (as being referrible to spiritual ends, and in some manner allied to religion,) and all spiritual things becoming temporal, as they conduce to the secular peace and prosperity of states: there is nothing which each of these powers will not hook within the verge of its cognisance and jurisdiction; each will claim a right to meddle in all things; one pretending thereby to further the good of the Church, the other to secure the interest of the state: and what end or remedy can there be of the differences hence arising; there being no third power to arbitrate or moderate between them?

Each will prosecute its cause by its advantages; the one by instruments of temporal power, the other by spiritual arms of censures and curses.

And in what a case must the poor people then be! how distracted in their consciences, how divided in their affections, how discordant in their practices! according as each pretence hath influence on them, by its different arguments or peculiar advantages.

* Vid. Guicciard. Machiav. Hist. Fl. p. 19. Conc. Bas. (p. 65.)
† Plat. in Joh. XVI. (p. 298.)

How can any man satisfy himself in performing or refusing obedience to either? How many (by the intricacy of the point, and contrary pulling) will be withdrawn from yielding due compliance on the one hand or the other!

What shall a man do, while one in case of disobedience to his commands doth brandish a sword, the other thundereth out a curse against him; one threateneth death, the other excision from the Church; both denounce damnation?

What animosities and contentions, what discomposures and confusions must this constitution of things breed in every place! and how can 'a kingdom so divided in itself stand,' or not 'come into desolation?'

Such an advantage infallibly will make Popes affect to invade the temporal power.

It was the reason which Pope Paschal* alleged against Henry IV. because he did *ecclesiæ regnum auferre*.

It is indeed impossible that a coordination of these powers should subsist; for each will be continually encroaching on the other; each for its own defence and support will continually be struggling and clambering to get above the other: there will never be any quiet, till one come to subside and truckle under the other; whereby the sovereignty of the one or the other will be destroyed. Each of them soon will come to claim a supremacy in all causes, and the power of both swords; and one side will carry it.

It is indeed necessary that men for a time continuing possessed with a reverence to the ecclesiastical authority, as independent and uncontrollable, it should at last overthrow the temporal, by reason of its great advantages above it; for

The spiritual power doth pretend an establishment purely divine; which cannot by any accidents undergo any change, diminutions, or translation, to which temporal dominions are subject: its power therefore being perpetual, irreversible, depending immediately of God, can hardly be checked, can never be conquered.†

It fighteth with tongues and pens, which are the most perilous weapons.

It can never be disarmed, fighting with weapons that cannot be taken away, or deprived of their edge and vigor.

It worketh by most powerful considerations on the consciences and affections of men, on pain of damnation, promising

* P. Pasch. II. Ep. 7.

† Vid. Mach. Hist. Flor. p. 18. P. Gel. Ep. 8. Felix P. Ep. i. (p. 597.)

heaven, and threatening hell: which on some men have an infinite sway, on all men a considerable influence; and thereby will be too hard for those who only can grant temporal rewards or inflict temporal punishments. It is surely a notable advantage that the Pope hath above all princes, that he commandeth not only as a prince, but as a guide; so that whereas we are not otherwise bound to obey the commands of princes, than as they appear concordant with God's law, we must observe his commands absolutely, as being therefore lawful, because he commandeth them, that involving his assertion of their lawfulness, to which (without further inquiry or scruple) we must submit our understanding, his words sufficiently authorising his commands for just. We are not only obliged to obey his commands, but to embrace his doctrines.

It hath continual opportunities of conversing with men; and thereby can insinuate and suggest the obligation to obey it, with greatest advantage, in secrecy, in the tenderest seasons.

It claimeth a power to have its instruction admitted with assent: and will it not instruct them for its own advantage? All its assertions must be believed—is not this an infinite advantage?

By such advantages the spiritual power (if admitted for such as it pretendeth) will swallow and devour the temporal; which will be an extreme mischief to the world.

The very pretence doth immediately crop and curtail the natural right of princes, by exempting great numbers of persons (the participants and dependents of this hierarchy) from subjection to them; by withdrawing causes from their jurisdiction; by commanding in their territories, and drawing people out of them to their judicatories; by having influence on their opinion; by draining them of wealth,* &c.

To this discourse experience abundantly doth yield its attestation; for how often have the Popes thwarted princes in the exercise of their power, challenging their laws and administrations as prejudicial to religion, as contrary to ecclesiastical liberty!

Bodin (l. 9.) observeth, that if any prince were a heretic, (that is, if the Pope could pick occasion to call him so,) or a tyrant, (that is, in his opinion,) or anywise scandalous, the Pope would excommunicate him; and would not receive him to favor, but on his acknowleging himself a feudatory to the Pope: so he drew in most kingdoms to depend on him.†

* P. Pasch. II. Ep. 28. 29.

† Vid. Tort. T. p. 216. Greg. VII. Ep. i. 7. cxii. 13. 63.

How often have they excommunicated them, and interdicted their people from entertaining communion with them!

How many commotions, conspiracies, rebellions, and insurrections against princes have they raised in several countries!*

How have they inveigled people from their allegiance! How many massacres and assassinations have they caused! How have they depressed and vilified the temporal power!

Have they not assumed to themselves superiority over all princes? The emperor himself (the chief of Christian princes) they did call their vassal,† exacting an oath from them, whereof you have a form in the canon law, and a declaration of Pope Clement V. that it is an oath of fealty.

Have they not challenged propriety in both swords; *Ecce duo gladii?*

How many princes have they pretended to depose, and dispossess of their authority!‡

Consider the pragmatical sanctions, provisors, compositions, concordats, &c. which princes have been forced to make against them, or with them, to secure their interest.

Many good princes have been forced to oppose them, as Henry the Second of England, King Lewis the Twelfth of France, (that just prince, *Pater Patriæ*,) *Perdam Babylonis nomen.*§

How often have they used this as a pretence of raising and fomenting wars! confiding in their spiritual arms; interdicting princes, that would not comply with their designs, for advancing the interests not only of their see, but of their private families!‖

Bodin observeth that Pope Nicholas I. was the first who excommunicated princes. Platina doth mention some before him: but it is remarkable that although Pope Leo I. (a high-spirited pope, (*fortissimus Leo*, as Liberatus calleth him) was highly provoked against Theodosius junior; Pope Gelasius, and divers of his predecessors and followers; Pope Gregory II. against Leo; Vigilius against Justinian, &c. yet none of them did presume to excommunicate the emperors.

All these dealings are the natural result of this pretence; and supposing it well grounded, are capable of a plausible justification: for is it not fit, (seeing one must yield,) that temporal should yield to spiritual?

Indeed, granting the Papal supremacy in spirituals, I con-

* Vid. Plat. de Bonif. VIII. p. 467. Jul. 2. Episc. Modrus. in Conc. Lat. V. Sess. 6. (p. 72.) See Greg. VII. Ep. iv. 2. viii. 21.

† Vid. Conc. Lugd. p. 851.

‡ Clement. lib. ii. tit. 9. cap. unicum.

§ Thuan. lib. 1. ‖ Thuan. lib. i. p. 42.

ceive the high-flying zealots of the Roman church, who subject all temporal powers to them, have great reason on their side; for coordinate power cannot subsist, and it would be only an eternal seminary of perpetual discords.

The quarrel cannot otherwise be well composed, than by wholly disclaiming the fictitious and usurped power of the Pope: for

Two such powers (so inconsistent and cross to each other, so apt to interfere, and consequently to breed everlasting mischiefs to mankind between them) could not be instituted by God.—

He would not appoint two different vicegerents in his kingdom at the same time.—

But it is plain that he hath instituted the civil power; and endowed it with a sword. That princes are his lieutenants.*

That in the ancient times the Popes did not claim such authority, but avowed themselves subjects to princes.

9. Consequently this pretence is apt to engage Christian princes against Christianity; for they will not endure to be crossed, to be depressed, to be trampled on.

This Popes often have complained of; not considering it was their own insolence that caused it.

10. Whereas now Christendom is split into many parcels, subject to divers civil sovereignties, it is expedient that correspondently there should be distinct ecclesiastical governments, independent of each other, which may comply with the respective civil authorities in promoting the good and peace both of Church and State.

It is fit that every prince should in all things govern all his subjects; and none should be exempted from subordination to his authority: as philosophers, and physicians of the body; so priests and physicians of the soul; not in exercising their function, but in taking care that they do exercise it duly for the honor of God, and in consistence with public good; otherwise many grievous inconveniences must ensue.

It is of perilous consequence, that foreigners should have authoritative influence on the subjects of any prince, or have power to intermeddle in affairs.

Princes have a natural right to determine with whom their subjects shall have intercourse: which is inconsistent with a right of foreigners to govern or judge them in any case, without their leave.

Every prince is obliged to employ the power intrusted to

* P. Anast. calleth the emperor Anast. Vicarium. Epist. (p. 670.) Eccl. Leod. p. 522.

him, to the furtherance of God's service, and encouragement of all good works; as a supreme power, without being liable to obstruction from any other power.

It would irritate his power, if another should be beyond his coercion.

It is observable that the Pope by intermeddling in the affairs of kingdoms did so wind himself into them, as to get a pretence to be master of each; princes being his vassals and feudatories.

11. Such an authority is needless and useless; it not serving the ends which it pretendeth; and they being better compassed without it.

It pretendeth to maintain truth; but indeed it is more apt to oppress it.

Truth is rather (as St. Cyprian wisely observeth) preserved by the multitude of bishops, whereof some will be ready to relieve it, when assaulted by others.

Truth cannot be supported merely by human authority; especially that authority is to be suspected which pretendeth dominion over our minds. What controversy, being doubtful in itself, will not after his decision continue doubtful? His sentence may be eluded by interpretation, as well as other testimonies or authorities.

The opinion of a man's great wisdom or skill may be the ground of assent, in defect of other more cogent arguments; but authority of name or dignity is not proper to convince a man's understanding. Men obey, but not believe princes more than others, if not more learned than others.

It pretendeth to maintain order: but how? by introducing slavery; by destroying all rights; by multiplying disorders; by hindering order to be quietly administered in each country.

It pretendeth to be the only means of unity and concord in opinion, by determining controversies: which its advocates affirm necessary.*

But how can that be necessary which never was *de facto*, not even in the Roman church?

Hath the Pope effected this? Do all his followers agree in all points? Do they agree about his authority? Do not they differ and dispute about infinity of questions? Are all the points frivolous, about which their divines and schoolmen dispute? Why did not the Council of Trent itself, without more ado, and keeping such a disputing, refer all to his oracular decision?

* Necesse est, ut omnes fideles idem sentiant. Bell. i. 9.

Necessary points may and will, by all honest people, be known and determined without him, by the clear testimony of Scripture, by consent of Fathers, by general tradition.—And other points need not to be determined.

That he may be capable of that office, he must be believed appointed by God thereto; which is a question itself to be decided without him, to satisfaction. His power is apt no otherwise to knock down controversies, than by depressing truth; not suffering any truth to be asserted, which doth not favor its interests.

Concord was maintained, and controversies decided, without them in the ancient Church; in synods, wherein he was not the sole judge, nor had observable influence.

The Fathers did not think such authority needful, otherwise they would have made more use of it.

A more ready way to define controversies is for every one not to prescribe to others, or to persecute; for then men would more calmly see the truth, and consent.

It pretendeth to maintain peace and unity. But nothing hath raised more fierce dissensions, or so many bloody wars in Christendom, as it.

It is apt by tyrannical administration to become intolerable, and so to break the ecclesiastical state; to raise schisms and troubles.

It is like to extinguish genuine charity, which is free and uncompelled.

All the peace and charity which it endureth is by force and compulsion, not out of choice and good affection.

V. The ancients did assert to each bishop a free, absolute, independent authority, subject to none, directed by none, accountable to none on earth, in the administration of affairs properly concerning his particular church.

This is most evident in St. Cyprian's writings; out of which it will not be amiss to set down some passages, manifesting the sense and practice of the Church in his time, to the satisfaction of any ingenuous mind.

"The bond of concord abiding, and the sacrament (or doctrine) of the Catholic Church persisting undivided, every bishop disposeth and directeth his own acts, being to render an account of his purpose to the Lord."* This he writeth, when he was pleading the cause of Pope Cornelius against Novatian; but then, it seemeth, not dreaming of his supremacy over others.

* Cypr. Ep. 52. (ad Antonianum.)

"But we know that some will not lay down what once they have imbibed, nor will easily change their mind; but, the bond of peace and concord with their colleagues being preserved, will retain some peculiar things, which have once been used by them; in which matter neither do we force any, or give law; whenas every prelate hath in the administration of his church the free power of his will, being to render unto the Lord an account of his acting."* This saith he, writing to Pope Stephanus, and in a friendly manner, "out of common respect and single love," (not out of servile obeisance,) acquainting him what he and his brethren in a synod, "by common consent and authority," had established concerning the degradation of clergymen who had been ordained by heretics, or had lapsed into schism.

"For seeing it is ordained by us all, and it is likewise equal and just that each man's cause should be there heard where the crime is committed; and to each pastor a portion of the flock is assigned, which each should rule and govern, being to render an account to his Lord; those indeed over whom we preside ought not to ramble about."† This saith he, in his epistle to Pope Cornelius, on occasion of some factious clergymen addressing themselves to him with factious suggestions, to gain his countenance.

"These things I have briefly written back, according to our meanness, dear brother; prescribing to none, nor prejudging, that every bishop should not do what he thinks good, having a free power of his will."‡

"In which matter our bashfulness and modesty doth not prejudge any one; so that every one may not judge as he thinketh, and act as he judgeth:"§ prescribing to none, "so that every bishop may not resolve what he thinks good, being to render an account to the Lord,"‖ &c.

"It remaineth that each of us do utter his opinion about this matter, judging no man, nor removing any man, if he dissenteth, from the right of communion; for neither doth any of us constitute himself bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical terror driveth his colleagues to a necessity of obeying; whenas every bishop hath on account of his liberty and authority his own free choice, and is no less exempted from being judged by another, than he is uncapable to judge another; but let us all

* Cypr. Ep. 72. (ad Stephanum.)
† Cypr. Ep. 55. (ad Cornelium.)
‡ Cypr. Ep. 73. (ad Jubabaianum.)
§ Cypr. Ep. 76. (ad Magnum.) ‖ Ibid.

expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, and who alone, hath power both to prefer us to the government of his Church, and to judge of our acting."* These words did St. Cyprian speak as prolocutor of the great synod of bishops at Carthage: and what words could be more express, or more full, in assertion of the episcopal liberties and rights, against almost every branch of Romish pretences?

He disavoweth the practice of one bishop excluding another from communion for dissent in opinion about disputable points; he rejecteth the pretence that any man can have, to be a bishop of bishops, or superior to all his brethren; he condemneth the imposing opinions on bishops, and constraining them to obedience; he disclaimeth any power in one bishop to judge another; he asserteth to each bishop a full liberty and power to manage his own concerns according to his discretion; he affirmeth every bishop to receive his power only from Christ, and to be liable only to his judgment.

We may observe that St. Austin,† in his reflexions on the passages in that synod, doth approve, yea admire, that preface, passing high commendations on the smartest passages of it which assert common liberty, professing his own conformity in practice to them: "In this consultation," saith he, "is showed a pacific soul, overflowing with plenty of charity;" and, "We have therefore a free choice of inquiry granted to us, by the most mild and most veracious speech of Cyprian himself;" ‡ and, "Now if the proud and tumid minds of heretics dare to extol themselves against the holy humility of this speech—than which what can be more gentle, more humble?§

Would St. Austin have swallowed those sayings, could he have so much applauded them, if he had known a just power then extant and radiant in the world, which they do impeach and subvert? No, I trow; he did not know, nor so much as dream of any such; although the Pope was under his nose while he was discussing that point, and he could hardly talk so much of St. Cyprian without thinking of Pope Stephen.

However let any man of sense honestly read and weigh those passages, considering who did write them, to whom he writ them, on what occasions he writ them, when he writ them; that he was a great primate of the Church, a most holy, most prudent, most humble and meek person; that he addressed divers of them to bishops of Rome; that many of them were

* Cypr. in præf. Conc. Carthag.
† Aug. de Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. ii. 3. &c.
‡ Lib. iii. cap. 3. § Lib. ii. cap. 3. Lib. iii. cap. 3.

touching the concerns of Popes; that he writ them in times of persecution and distress, which produce the most sober and serious thoughts; then let him, if he can, conceive that all Christian bishops were then held subject to the Pope, or owned such a power due to him as he now claimeth.

We may add a contemporary testimony of the Roman clergy, addressing to St. Cyprian these words: "Although a mind well conscious to itself, and supported by the vigor of evangelical discipline, and having in heavenly doctrines become a true witness to itself, is wont to be content with God for its only judge; and not to desire the praises, nor to dread the accusations of another; yet they are worthy of double praise, who when they know they owe their consciences to God only as judge, yet desire also their actions to be approved by their brethren themselves; the which it is no wonder that you, brother Cyprian, should do, who, according to your modesty and natural industry, would have us not so much judges as partakers of your counsels—."* Then it seems the college of cardinals, not so high in the instep as they are now, did take St. Cyprian to be free, and not accountable for his actions to any other judge but God.

That this notion of liberty did continue a good time after in the Church, we may see by that canon of the Antiochene synod, "ordaining that every bishop have power of his own bishopric, govern it according to the best of his care and discretion, and provide for all the country belonging to his city, so as to ordain priests and deacons, and dispose things aright."†

The monks of Constantinople, in the synod of Chalcedon, said thus; "We are sons of the Church, and have one father, after God, our archbishop:"‡ they forgot their sovereign father the Pope.

The like notion may seem to have been then in England, when the church of Canterbury was called "the common mother of all under the disposition of its spouse Jesus Christ."§

VI. The ancients‖ did hold all bishops, as to their office, originally according to divine institution, or abstracting from human sanctions framed to preserve order and peace, to be equal: for that all are successors of the Apostles; all derive their commission and power in the same tenor from God; all of them are ambassadors, stewards, vicars of Christ, intrusted with the

* Cler. Rom. ad Cypr. Ep. 31. † Syn. Ant. Can. 9.
‡ Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p 114.
§ Gervas. Dorob. (p. 1663.) apud Twisd. p. 72.
‖ Vid. Ep. P. Celest. I. in Conc. Eph. Act. ii. (p. 324.)

same divine ministries of instructing, dispensing the sacraments, ruling and exercising discipline: to which functions and privileges the least bishop hath right, and to greater the biggest cannot pretend.

One bishop might exceed another in splendor, in wealth, in reputation, in extent of jurisdiction, as one king may surpass another in amplitude of territory; but as all kings, so all bishops are equal in office and essentials of power, derived from God.

Hence they applied to them that in the Psalm, 'Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children, whom thou mayest make princes in all the earth.'*

This was St. Jerome's doctrine in those famous words; "Wherever a bishop be, whether at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Thanis, he is of the same worth and of the same priesthood; the force of wealth and lowness of poverty doth not render a bishop more high or more low; for that all of them are successors of the Apostles:"† to evade which plain assertion, they have forged distinctions, whereof St. Jerome surely did never think, he speaking simply concerning bishops, as they stood by divine institution, not according to human models, which gave some advantages over other.

That this notion did continue long in the Church, we may see by the elogies of bishops in later synods; for instance, that in the synod of Compeigne; "It is convenient all Christians should know what kind of office the bishop's is,—who it is plain are the vicars of Christ, and keep the keys of the kingdom of heaven."‡

And that of the synod of Melun; "And though all of us unworthy, yet are the vicars of Christ, and successors of his Apostles."§

In contemplation of which verity, St. Gregory Nazianzen, observing the declension from it introduced in his times by the ambition of some prelates, did vent that famous exclamation; "O that there were not at all any presidency, or any preference in place, and tyrannical enjoyment of prerogatives!"‖—which earnest wish he surely did not mean to level against the ordinance of God, but against that which lately began to be intruded by men. And what would the good man have wished,

* Baron. an. 57. §. 30. Ps. xlv. 16.
† Hieron. ad Evagr. Ep. 85.
‡ Syn. Compend. ann. Dom. 833. (apud Bin. tom. vi. p. 361.)
§ Syn. Meldens. ann. Dom. 845. (apud Bin. tom. vi. p. 402.)
‖ Greg. Naz. Orat. 28.

if he had been aware of those pretences, about which we discourse; which then did only begin to bud and peep up in the world?

1. Common practice is a good interpreter of common sentiments in any case; and it therefore showeth that in the primitive Church the Pope was not deemed to have a right of universal sovereignty: for if such a thing had been instituted by God, or established by the Apostles, the Pope certainly with evident clearness would have appeared to have possessed it; and would have sometimes (I might say frequently, yea continually) have exercised it in the first ages: which that he did not at all, we shall make, I hope, very manifest, by reflecting on the chief passages occurring then; whereof indeed there is scarce any one, which, duly weighed, doth not serve to overthrow the Roman pretence: but that matter I reserve to another place; and shall propound other considerations, declaring the sense of the Fathers; only I shall add, that indeed,

2. The state of the most primitive Church did not well admit such an universal sovereignty. For that did consist of small bodies incoherently situated, and scattered about in very distant places, and consequently unfit to be modelled into one political society, or to be governed by one head. Especially considering their condition under persecution and poverty. What convenient resort for direction or justice could a few distressed Christians in Egypt, Ethiopia, Parthia, India, Mesopotamia, Syria, Armenia, Cappadocia, and other parts, have to Rome! What trouble, what burden had it been, to seek instruction, succor, decision of cases thence! Had they been obliged or required to do so, what offences, what clamors would it have raised! seeing that afterward, when Christendom was connected and compacted together, when the state of Christians was flourishing and prosperous, when passages were open, and the best of opportunities of correspondence were afforded, yet the setting out of these pretences did cause great oppositions and stirs; seeing the exercise of this authority, when it had obtained most vigor, did produce so many grievances, so many complaints, so many courses to check and curb it, in countries feeling the inconveniences and mischiefs springing from it.

The want of the like in the first ages is a good argument, that the cause of them had not yet sprung up; Christendom could not have been so still, if there had been then so meddlesome a body in it, as the Pope now is.

The Roman clergy, in their Epistle to St. Cyprian, told him, that "because of the difficulty of things and times, they could not constitute a bishop who might moderate things"

immediately belonging to them in their own precincts:* how much more in that state of things would a bishop there be fit to moderate things over all the world: when, as Rigaltius truly noteth, "the Church being then oppressed with various vexations, the communication of provinces between themselves was difficult and unfrequent."†

Wherefore Bellarmine himself doth confess, that in those times, before the Nicene synod, "the authority of the Pope was not a little hindered, so that because of continual persecutions he could not freely exercise it."‡

The Church therefore could so long subsist without the use of such authority, by the vigilance of governors over their flocks, and the friendly correspondence of neighbor churches: and if he would let it alone, it might do so still.

That could be no divine institution, which had no vigor in the first and best times; but an innovation raised by ambition.

VII. The ancients, when occasion did require, did maintain their equality of office and authority, particularly in respect to the Roman bishops; not only interpretatively by practice, but directly and formally in express terms asserting it.

Thus when Felicissimus and his complices, being rejected by St. Cyprian, did apply themselves to Pope Cornelius for his communion and countenance, St. Cyprian affirmed that to be an irregular and unjust course; subjoining, "Except to a few desperate and wicked persons, the authority of the bishops constituted in Afric, who have already judged of them, do seem less;" that is, inferior to any other authority, particularly to that of Rome, unto which they had recourse: what other meaning could he have? Doth not his argument require this meaning?

Another instance is that of the Fathers of the Antiochene synod,§ (being ninety-seven bishops,) the which St. Hilary calleth, "a synod of saints congregated,"‖ (the decrees whereof the Catholic Church did admit into its code, and the canons whereof Popes have called venerable:¶) these in their Epistle to Pope Julius, complaining of his demeanor in the case of Athanasius, did flatly assert to themselves an equality with him; "They did not," as Sozomen reciteth out of their Epistle, "therefore think it equal, that they should be thought inferiors, because they had not so big and numerous a church."**

That Pope himself testifieth the same in his Epistle to them,

* Cl. Rom. ad Cypr. Ep. 31.
† Rigalt. in Cypr. Ep. 67.
‡ Bell. de R. P. ii. 17.
§ Hilar. de Synodis. (p. 367.)
‖ Hilar. ibid.
¶ P. Nicol. I. Ep. ix. (p. 519.)
** Soz. iii. 8.

extant in the second apology of Athanasius; "If," saith he, "ye do truly conceive the honor of bishops to be equal, and the same; and ye do not, as ye write, judge of bishops according to the magnitude of cities:"* which assertion of theirs so flatly thwarting papal supremacy he doth not at all confute, yea not so much as contradict; and therefore reasonably may be interpreted to yield consent thereto: the rule, "He that holdeth his peace seemeth to consent," never holding better than in this case, when his copyhold was so nearly touched: indeed he had been very blameable to wave such an occasion of defending so important a truth, or in letting so pestilent an error to pass without correction or reproof.

After the Pope had climbed higher than at that time, (on the ladders of dissension and disorders in the Church,) yet he was reproved by Euphemius, bishop of Constantinople, for preferring himself before his brethren; as we may collect from those words of a zealous Pope, "We desire not to be placed above others, (as you say,) so much as to have fellowship holy and well-pleasing to God with all the faithful."†

That Pope Gregory I. did not hold himself superior to other bishops, many sayings of his do infer: for in this he placeth the fault of the bishop of Constantinople, which he so often and so severely reprehendeth, that he did "prefer himself before, and extol himself above other bishops." ‡

And would he directly assume that to himself which he chargeth on another, although only following his position by consequence?

And when Eulogius the bishop of Alexandria had complimentally said, *Sicut jussistis*, "As ye commanded;" he doth thus express his resentment: "That word of command I desire you let me not hear; because I know who I am, and who ye are: by place ye are my brethren; in goodness, fathers: I did not therefore command; but what seemed profitable, I hinted to you."§

That many such instances may not be alleged out of antiquity, the reason is, because the ancient Popes did not understand this power to belong to them, and therefore gave no occasion for bishops to maintain their honor; or were more just, prudent, and modest than to take so much on them, as their successors did, on frivolous pretences.

* P. Jul. I. apud Athan. in Apol. ii. (p. 744.)
† P. Gelas. I. Ep. 1. (ad Euphemium.)
‡ P. Greg. I. Ep. vi 30. Id. Ep. iv. 36. Id. Ep. iv. 38——.
§ Greg I. Ep. vii. 30. (ad Eulog. Alex.)

VIII. The style used by the primitive bishops in their applications to the Roman bishop doth signify that they did not apprehend him their sovereign, but their equal.

Brother, colleague, fellow-bishop, are the terms which St. Cyprian* doth use in speaking about the Roman bishops, his contemporaries, Fabianus, Cornelius, Lucius, Stephanus; and in his Epistles to the three last of them; nor doth he ever use any other, importing higher respect due to them; as indeed his practice demonstrateth he did not apprehend any other due; or that he did take them for his superiors in office. "Know now, brother," was the compellation of Dionysius (bishop of Alexandria) to Pope Stephanus.† The synod of Antioch, which rejected Paulus Samosatenus, inscribeth its epistle to "Dionysius (then bishop of Rome) and Maximus, and all our fellow-ministers through the world."‡

The old synod of Arles directeth their epistle "to Seignior Sylvester, their brother." Athanasius saith, "These things may suffice, which have been written by our beloved and fellow-minister Damasus, bishop of great Rome."§ Marcellus inscribed to Pope Julius, to his "most blessed fellow-minister."‖ So Cyril spake of Pope Celestine I, "Our brother and fellow-minister, the bishop of Rome."¶ So St. Basil, and his fellow-bishops of the east, did inscribe their epistle, "To the beloved of God, and our most holy brethren and fellow-ministers, the unanimous bishops through Italy and France."** In this style do the Fathers of Sardica salute Pope Julius; those of Constantinople, Pope Damasus;†† those of Ephesus, Pope Celestine I. "Our brother and fellow-minister Celestine:"‡‡ those of Carthage, Pope Celestine I. in the very same terms wherein St. Austin doth salute Maximinus, a Donatist bishop, "Seignior, my beloved and most honored brother."§§ The oriental bishops, Eustathius, Theophilus, and Silvanus, did inscribe their remonstrance to Pope Liberius, "To seignior, our brother and fellow-minister, Liberius."‖‖ So John of Antioch to Nestorius writeth, "To my master."¶¶ The synod of Illyricum call Elpidius, "Our seignior and fellow-minister."***

* Cypr. Ep. 4. 41. 58. 67. &c. † Euseb. vii. 5. ‡ Ibid. 3.
§ Athan. Ep. ad Afr. (p. 931.)
‖ Marcell. ad P. Jul. Epiph. Hær. 72.
¶ Cyril. ad Nest. in Syn. Eph. p. 207.
** Bas. Ep. 69. Athanas. Apol. ii. (p. 761. 756.)
†† Theod. v. 9. ‡‡ Syn. Eph. p. 217.
§§ Aug. Ep. 203. ‖‖ Socr. iv. 12.
¶¶ Conc. Eph. 202. *** Theod. iv. 9.

In which instances, and some others of later date, we may observe that the word κύριος, or *dominus*, was then (as it is now) barely a term of civility, being then usually given to any person of quality, or to whom they would express common respect; so that St. Chrysostom in his epistles commonly doth give it, not only to meaner bishops, but even to priests; and St. Austin doth thus salute even Donatist bishops, reflecting thereon thus; "Since therefore by charity I serve you in this office of writing letters to you, I do not improperly call you master, for the sake of our one true Master, who has commanded us so to do."* "—my most honored master."† "—now therefore having with me my most honored seignior and most reverend presbyter,"‡ &c. "—my most honored master Asyncritus the elder."§

Pope Celestine himself did salute the Ephesine Fathers, κύριοι ἀδελφοὶ, masters, brethren.‖ Even in the sixth council, Thomas, bishop of Constantinople, did inscribe according to the old style, to Pope Vitalianus, "his brother and fellow-minister."¶

The French bishops had good reason to expostulate with Pope Nicholas I. "You may know that we are not, as you boast and brag, your clerks; whom, if pride would suffer, you ought to acknowlege for your brethren and fellow-bishops."**

Such are the terms and titles which primitive integrity, when they meant to speak most kindly and respectfully, did allow to the Pope, being the same which all bishops did give to one another; (as may be seen in all solemn addresses and reports concerning them:) which is an argument sufficiently plain, that bishops in those times did not take themselves to be the Pope's subjects, or his inferiors in office; but his fellows and mates, coordinate in rank.

Were not these improper terms for an ordinary gentleman or nobleman to accost his prince in? yet hardly is there such a distance between any prince and his peers, as there is between a modern Pope and other bishops.

It would now be taken for a great arrogance and sauciness, for an underling bishop to address to the Pope in such language, or to speak of him in that manner; which is a sign that the world is altered in its notion of him, and that he beareth a

* Aug. Ep. 103. † Chrys. Ep. 26. ‡ Id. ibid.
§ Ep. 68. (71. 75. 77. 84. 91. &c.)
‖ P. Celest. I. Ep. ad Syn. Eph. Act. ii. (p. 324.)
¶ Conc. 6. Act. xiii. p. 224.
** An. Franc. Pith. (an. 858.)

higher conceit of himself than his primitive ancestors did. Now nothing but *Beatissimus Pater*, Most blessed Father; and *Dominus noster Papa*, Our lord the Pope, in the highest sense, will satisfy him.

Now a Pope in a general synod, in a solemn oration, could be told to his face that the most holy senate of cardinals had chosen a brother into a father, a colleague into a lord.* Verily so it is now, but not so anciently.

In the same ancient times, the style of the Roman bishops writing to other bishops was the same; he calling them brethren and fellow-ministers.

So did Cornelius write to Fabius of Antioch, 'Beloved brother;'† so did he call all other bishops,—'Be it known to all our fellow-bishops and brethren.'‡ So Julius to the oriental bishops, 'To our beloved brethren.'§ So Liberius to the Macedonian bishops, 'To our beloved brethren and fellow-ministers:'‖ and to the oriental bishops, 'To our brethren and fellow-bishops.'¶ So Damasus to the bishops of Illyricum. So Leo himself frequently in his epistles. So Pope Celestine calleth John of Antioch, 'Most honored brother;'** to Cyril and to Nestorius himself, 'Beloved brother;'†† to the fathers of Ephesus, 'Seigniors, brethren.'‡‡ Pope Gelasius to the bishops of Dardania, 'Your brotherhood.'§§ St. Gregory to Cyriacus, 'Our brother and fellow-priest, Cyriacus.'

If it be said, the Popes did write so then out of condescension, or humility and modesty; it may be replied that if really there was such a difference as is now pretended, it may seem rather affectation, and indecency or mockery: for it would have more become the Pope to maintain the majesty and authority of his place, by appellations apt to cherish their reverence, than to collogue with them in terms void of reality, or signifying that equality which he did not mean.

But Bellarmine hath found out one instance (which he maketh much of) of Pope Damasus, who writing (not, as he allegeth, to the Fathers of Constantinople, but) to certain eastern bishops, calleth them 'most honored sons.'‖‖ That whole epistle I do fear to be foisted into Theodoret; for it cometh in abruptly; and doth not much become such a man: and if it be

* Balt. Delrio. in Conc. Later. ad Leonem X. Sess. viii. (p. 85.)
† Euseb. vi. 43. ‡ P. Corn. apud Cypr. Epist. 48.
§ Athan. P. 739. ‖ Socr. iv. 12.
¶ Hil. Frag. p. 450. ** Conc. Eph. p. 196.
†† P. 179. 183. ‡‡ Act. ii. p. 324.
§§ P. Gelas. Ep. 12. Greg.—Ep. vi. 24.
‖‖ Bell. ii. 14. Theod. v. 10.

supposed genuine, I should suspect some corruption in the place; for why, if he writ to bishops, should he use a style so unsuitable to those times, and so different from that of his predecessors and successors? Why should there be such a disparity between his own style now and at other times? for writing to the bishops of Illyricum, he calleth them, 'beloved brethren:'* why then is he so inconstant and partial as to yield these oriental bishops less respect? wherefore perhaps *υἱοὶ* was thrust in for *ἀδελφοί·* or perhaps the word *ἐπισκόποις* was intruded, and he did write to laymen; 'those who governed the east,' who well might be called 'most honored sons;' otherwise the epithet doth not seem well to suit; but however, a single example of arrogance or stateliness (or of what shall I call it?) is not to be set against so many modest and mannerly ones.

In fine, that this salutation doth not always imply superiority, we may be assured by that inscription of Alexander, bishop of Thessalonica, to Athanasius of Alexandria, 'To my beloved son and unanimous colleague, Athanasius.'†

IX. The ground of that eminence which the Roman bishop did obtain in the Church, so as in order to precede other bishops, doth shake this pretence.

The church of Rome was indeed allowed to be the principal church, as St. Cyprian calleth it:‡ but why? Was it preferred by divine institution? No surely; Christianity did not make laws of that nature, or constitute differences of places. Was it in regard to the succession of St. Peter? No; that was a slim, upstart device; that did not hold in Antioch, nor in other apostolical churches.

But it was for a more substantial reason; the very same on which the dignity and preeminency of other churches was founded; that is, the dignity, magnitude, opulency, opportunity of that city in which the bishop of Rome did preside; together with the consequent numerousness, quality, and wealth of his flock; which gave him many great advantages above other his fellow-bishops: it was, saith Rigaltius, called by St. Cyprian the principal church, "because constituted in the principal city."§

That church in the very times of severest persecutions, "by the providence of God,‖ (as Pope Cornelius said in his epistle to Fabius,) had a rich and plentiful number, with a most great

* Soz. vi. 23. † Apud Athan. Apol. ii. p. 783.
‡ Ep. 55. § Rigalt. in Cypr. Ep. 55.
‖ Euseb. vi. 43. Cypr. Ep. 55. (ad Corn.)

and innumerable people;" so that he reckoneth forty-four presbyters, seven deacons, (in imitation of the number in the Acts,) seven sub-deacons, forty-two acoluthi, fifty-two others of the inferior clergy, and above fifteen hundred alms-people.

To that church there must needs have been a great resort of Christians, going to the seat of the empire in pursuit of business; as in proportion there was to each other metropolis; according to that canon of the Antiochene synod, which ordered that "the bishop of each metropolis should take care of the whole province, because all that had business did resort to the metropolis."*

That church was most able to yield help and succor to them who needed it; and accordingly did use to do it; according to that of Dionysius, (bishop of Corinth,) in his epistle to Bishop Soter of Rome; "This," saith he, "is your custom from the beginning, in divers ways to do good to the brethren, and to send supplies to many churches in every city, so refreshing the poverty of those who want."†

Whence it is no wonder that the head of that church did get most reputation, and the privilege of precedence without competition.

"To this church," said Irenæus, "it is necessary that every church (that is, the faithful who are all about) should resort, because of its more powerful principality:"‡ what is meant by that resort will be easy to him who considereth how men here are wont to go up to London, drawn thither by interests of trade, law, &c. What he did understand "by more powerful principality," the words themselves do signify, which exactly do agree to the power and grandeur of the imperial city, but do not well suit to the authority of a church; especially then when no church did appear to have either principality or puissance. And that sense may clearly be evinced by the context, wherein it doth appear that St. Irenæus doth not allege the judicial authority of the Roman church, but its credible testimony, which thereby became more considerable, because Christians commonly had occasions of recourse to it.

Such a reason of precedence St. Cyprian giveth in another case, "Because," saith he, "Rome for its magnitude ought to precede Carthage."§

For this reason a Pagan historian did observe the Roman

* Syn. Ant. can. 9.
† Dionys. Corinth. apud Euseb. iv. 23. ‡ Iren. iii. 3.
§ Cypr. Ep. 49.

bishop "had a greater authority (that is, a greater interest and reputation) than other bishops."*

This reason Theodoret doth assign in his epistle to Pope Leo, wherein he doth highly compliment and cajole him; "For this city," saith he, "is the greatest, and the most splendid, and presiding over the world; and flowing with multitude of people; and which moreover hath produced the empire now governing"†——

This is the sole ground on which the greatest of all ancient synods, that of Chalcedon, did affirm the papal eminency to be founded; for, "To the throne," say they, "of ancient Rome, because that was the royal city, the Fathers reasonably conferred the privileges:"‡ the fountain of papal eminence was in their judgment not any divine institution, not the authority of St. Peter deriving itself to his successors; but the concession of the Fathers, who were moved to grant it on account that Rome was the imperial city.

To the same purpose the Empress Placidia, in her epistle to Theodosius in behalf of Pope Leo, saith, "It becometh us to preserve to this city (the which is mistress of all lands) a reverence in all things."§

This reason had indeed in it much of equity, of decency, of conveniency; it was equal that he should have the preference, and more than common respect, who was thence enabled and engaged to do most service to religion. It was decent that out of conformity to the state, and in respect to the imperial court and senate, the pastor of that place should be graced with repute; it was convenient that he who resided in the centre of all business, and had the greatest influence on affairs, who was the emperor's chief counsellor for direction, and instrument for execution of ecclesiastical affairs, should not be put behind others.

Hence did the Fathers of the second general synod advance the bishop of Constantinople "to the next privileges of honor after the bishop of Rome, because it was new Rome," and a seat of the empire.‖

And the Fathers of Chalcedon assigned "equal privileges to the most holy see of new Rome, with good reason, (say they,) judging that the city which was honored with the royalty and senate, and which (otherwise) did enjoy equal privileges

* Amm. Marcell. lib. xv. (p. 47.)
† Theod. Ep. 113.
‡ Syn. Chalc. Act. xvi. can. 28.
§ Placid in Syn. Chalc. p. 27.
‖ Syn. Const. can. 3.

with the ancient royal Rome, should likewise in ecclesiastical affairs be magnified as it, being second after it."*

Indeed on this score the church of Constantinople is said to have aspired to the supreme principality, when it had the advantage over old Rome, the empire being extinguished there; and sometime was styled, "the head of all Churches."†

It is also natural, and can hardly be otherwise, but that the bishop of a chief city (finding himself to exceed in wealth, in power, in advantages of friendships, dependences, &c. should not affect to raise himself above the level: it is an ambition that easily will seize on the most moderate, and otherwise religious minds. Pope Leo objected it to Anatolius, and Pope Gregory to John, (from his austere life called *the Faster.*)

On the like account it was, that the bishops of other cities did mount to a preeminency, metropolitan, primatical, patriarchal.

Thence it was that the bishop of Alexandria, before Constantine's time, did acquire the honor of second place to Rome; because that city, being head of a most rich and populous nation, did in magnitude and opulency (as Gregory Nazianzen saith) "approach next to Rome, so as hardly to yield the next place to it."‡

On that account also did Antioch get the next place; as being the most large, florishing, commanding city of the east; "the which," as Josephus saith, "for bigness and for other advantages, had without controversy the third place in all the world subject to the Romans;"§ and the which St. Chrysostom calleth "the head of all cities seated in the east."‖

St. Basil seemeth to call the church thereof the principal in the world; for, "What," saith he, "can be more opportune to the churches over the world, than the church of Antioch? the which, if it should happen to be reduced to concord, nothing would hinder, but that as a sound head it would supply health to the whole body."¶

On the same account the bishop of Carthage did obtain the privilege to be standing primate of his province, (although other primacies there were not fixed to places, but followed seniority,) and a kind of patriarch over all the African provinces.

Hence did Cæsarea, as exceeding in temporal advantages,

* Syn. Chal. can. 28.

† Imp. Leo. Cod. lib. i. tit. 2. §. 16. Plat. in Bonif. III. (p. 161.) Anastas. in Bonif. III. Idem Sabellicus, Blondus, Lætus, &c. tradunt.

‡ Greg. Naz. Orat. 27.

§ Joseph. de Bello. Jud. iii. 3.

‖ Chrys. ἀνδρ. β'.

¶ Bas. Ep. 48. (ad Athanas.)

and being the political metropolis of Palestine, overtop Jerusalem, that most ancient, noble, and venerable city, the source of our religion.

It was indeed the general rule and practice to conform the privileges of ecclesiastical dignity in a proportion convenient to those of the secular government, as the synod of Antioch in express terms did ordain; the ninth canon whereof runneth thus: "The bishops in every province ought to know that the bishop presiding in the metropolis doth undertake the care of all the province; because all that have business do meet together in the metropolis; whence it hath been ordained that he should precede in honor, and that the bishops should do nothing extraordinary without him; according to a more ancient canon holding from our Fathers;"* (that is, according to the thirty-fourth canon of the Apostles.)

It is true that the Fathers do sometimes mention the Church of Rome being founded by the two great Apostles, or the succession of the Roman bishop to them in pastoral charge, as a special ornament of that church, and a congruous ground of respect to that bishop, whereby they "did honor the memory of St. Peter:"† but even some of those, who did acknowlege this, did not avow it as a sufficient ground of preeminence; none did admit it for an argument of authoritative superiority.

St. Cyprian did call the Roman see the chair of St. Peter, and the principal church;‡ yet he disclaimed any authority of the Roman bishops above his brethren.

Firmilian did take notice that Pope Stephanus "did glory in the place of his bishopric, and contend that he held the succession of Peter;"§ yet did not he think himself thereby obliged to submit to his authority, or follow his judgment; but sharply did reprehend him, as a favorer of heretics, an author of schisms, and one who had cut himself off from the communion of his brethren.

The Fathers of the Antiochene synod "did confess that in writings all did willingly honor the Roman church, as having been from the beginning the school of the Apostles, and the metropolis of religion; although yet from the east the instructors of the Christian doctrine did go and reside there; but from hence they desired not to be deemed inferiors; because they did not exceed in the greatness and numerousness of their church."||

* Syn. Ant. can. 9. Syn. Chalc. 17.
† Valentin. Nov. 24. in fin. Cod. Theod. ‡ Ep. lv. 52.
§ Firmil. apud Cypr. Ep. 75. || Soz. iii. 8.

They allowed some regard (though faintly and with reservation) to the Roman Church on account of their apostolical foundation; they implied a stronger ground of pretence from the grandeur of that city; yet did not they therefore grant themselves to be inferiors; at least as to any substantial privilege, importing authority.

If by divine right, on account of his succession to St. Peter, he had such preeminence, why are the other causes reckoned, as if they could add any thing to God's institution, or as if that did need human confirmation? The pretence to that surely was weak, which did need corroboration, and to be propped by worldly considerations.

Indeed, whereas the Apostles did found many churches, exercising apostolical authority over them, (eminently containing the episcopal,) why in conscience should one claim privileges on that score rather than or above the rest?

Why should the see of Antioch, "that most ancient and truly apostolical Church,"* where the Christian name began, where St. Peter at first (as they say) did sit bishop for seven years, be postponed to Alexandria?

Especially why should the church of Jerusalem, 'the seat of our Lord himself, the mother of all churches,' the fountain of Christian doctrine, the first consistory of the Apostles, ennobled by so many glorious performances, (by the life, preaching, miracles, death, burial, resurrection, ascension of our Saviour; by the first preaching of the Apostles, the effusion of the Holy Spirit, the conversion of so many people, and constitution of the first church, and celebration of the first synods,) on these considerations, not obtain preeminence to other churches, but in honor be cast behind divers others; and as to power be subjected to Cæsarea, the metropolis of Palestine?

The true reason of this even Baronius himself did see and acknowlege; for, "That," saith he, "the ancients observed no other rule in instituting the ecclesiastical sees, than the division of provinces, and the prerogative before established by the Romans, there are very many examples."†

Of which examples, that of Rome is the most obvious and notable; and what he so generally asserteth may be so applied thereto, as to void all other grounds of its preeminence.

X. The truth is, all ecclesiastical presidences and subordinations, or dependences of some bishops on others in adminis-

* Ep. Synod. Const. Theodoret. Hist. l. v. cap. 9. p. 211. Baron. ann. 39. §. 10.

† Id. ibid.

tration of spiritual affairs, were introduced merely by human ordinance, and established by law or custom, on prudential accounts, according to the exigency of things: hence the prerogatives of other sees did proceed; and hereto whatever dignity, privilege, or authority the Pope with equity might at any time claim, is to be imputed.

To clear which point, we will search the matter nearer the quick; propounding some observations concerning the ancient forms of discipline, and considering what interest the Pope had therein.

At first each church was settled apart under its own bishop and presbyters; so as independently and separately to manage its own concernments; each was αὐτοκέφαλος, and αὐτόνομος, 'governed by its own head, and had its own laws.' Every bishop, as a prince in his own church, did act freely, according to his will and discretion, with the advice of his ecclesiastical senate, and with the consent of his people,* (the which he did use to consult,) without being controllable by any other, or accountable to any, farther than his obligation to uphold the verity of Christian profession, and to maintain fraternal communion in charity and peace with neighboring churches did require; in which regard if he were notably peccant, he was liable to be disclaimed by them, as no good Christian, and rejected from communion, together with his church, if it did adhere to him in his misdemeanors. This may be collected from the remainders of state in the times of St. Cyprian.

But because little, disjointed, and incoherent bodies were like dust, apt to be dissipated by every wind of external assault or intestine faction; and peaceable union could hardly be retained without some ligature of discipline; and churches could not mutually support and defend each other without some method of intercourse and rule of confederacy engaging them: therefore for many good purposes† (for upholding and advancing the common interests of Christianity, for protection and support of each church from inbred disorders and dissensions, for preserving the integrity of the faith, for securing the concord of divers churches, for providing fit pastors to each church, and correcting such as were scandalously bad or unfaithful‡) it was soon found needful that divers churches should be combined and linked together in some regular form of discipline; that if

* Cypr. Ep. 52. 55. 72. 73. 76. P. Corn. apud Cypr. Ep. 46. Cypr. Ep. 40. (Plebi Univ.)

† Cypr. Ep. 14. Id. Ep. 76.

‡ Particularly in the dispensation of church goods. Conc. Ant. can. 25.

any church did want a bishop, the neighbor bishops might step in to approve and ordain a fit one;* that if any bishop did notoriously swerve from the Christian rule, the others might interpose to correct or void him;† that if any error or schism did peep up in any church, the joint concurrence of divers bishops might avail to stop its progress, and to quench it, by convenient means of instruction, reprehension, and censure; that if any church were oppressed by persecution, by indigency, by faction, the others might be engaged to afford effectual succor and relief: for such ends it was needful that bishops in certain precincts should convene, with intent to deliberate and resolve about the best expedients to compass them; and that the manner of such proceeding (to avoid uncertain distraction, confusion, arbitrariness, dissatisfaction, and mutinous opposition) should be settled in an ordinary course, according to rules known and allowed by all.

In defining such precincts it was most natural, most easy, most commodious, to follow the divisions of territory or jurisdiction already established in the civil state; that the spiritual administrations, being in such circumstances aptly conformed to the secular, might go on more smoothly and expeditely, the wheels of one not clashing with the other; according to the judgment of the two great synods, that of Chalcedon and the Trullane; which did ordain that "if by royal authority any city be, or should hereafter be reestablished, the order of the churches shall be according to the civil and public form."‡

Whereas therefore in each nation or province subject to one political jurisdiction there was a metropolis, or head city, to which the greatest resort was for dispensation of justice, and dispatch of principal affairs emergent in that province;§ it was also most convenient that also the determination of ecclesiastical matters should be affixed thereto; especially considering that usually those places were opportunely seated; that many persons on other occasions did meet there; that the churches in those cities did exceed the rest in number, in opulency, in ability and opportunity to promote the common interest in all kinds of advantages.

Moreover because in all societies and confederacies of men for ordering public affairs, (for the setting things in motion, for effectual dispatch, for preventing endless dissensions and con-

* Nov. cxxxvii. cap. 4. cxxiii. cap. 10.
† Vid. Can. Apost. 38. (al. 30.) de Synodis.
‡ Conc. Chalced. can. 17. et Conc. Trull. can. 38.
§ P. Anacl. Dist. xcix. cap. 1. P. Greg. VII. Ep. vi. 35.

fusions both in resolving on and executing things,) it is needful that one person should be authorised to preside among the rest, unto whom the power and care should be intrusted to convoke assemblies in fit season, to propose matters for consultation, to moderate the debates and proceedings, to declare the result, and to see that what is agreed on may be duly executed; such a charge then naturally would devolve itself on the prelate of the metropolis, as being supposed constantly present on the place: as being at home in his own seat of presidence, and receiving the rest under his wing; as incontestably surpassing others in all advantages answerable to the secular advantages of his city; for that it was unseemly and hard if he at home should be postponed in dignity to others repairing thither; for that also commonly he was in a manner the spiritual father of the rest, (religion being first planted in great cities, and thence propagated to others,) so that the reverence and dependence on colonies to the mother city was due from other churches to his see.

Wherefore by consent of all churches, grounded on such obvious reason of things, the presidency in each province was assigned to the bishop of the metropolis, who was called the first bishop, the metropolitan (in some places the primate,* the archbishop, the patriarch, the Pope) of the province. The apostolical canons call him the first bishop,† (which showeth the antiquity of this institution;) the African synods ‡ did appoint that name to him as most modest, and calling him primate in that sense: other ancient synods style him the metropolite; and to the metropolites of the principal cities they gave the title of archbishop. The bishops of Rome and Alexandria peculiarly were called Popes; although that name was sometimes deferred to any other bishop.

During this state of things the whole Church did consist of so many provinces, being *αὐτοκέφαλοι*, independent on each other in ecclesiastical administrations; each reserving to itself the constitution of bishops, the convocation of synods, the enacting of canons, the decision of causes, the definition of questions; yet so that each province did hold peaceful and amicable correspondence with others; on the like terms as before each *παροικία*, or episcopal precinct, did hold intercourse with its neighbors.

§And whoever in any province did not comply with or submit

* Primas provinciæ. Cod. Afr. can. 19. † Can. Apost. 27.
‡ Cod. Afr. can. 39. Dist. xcix. cap. 3.
§ Syn. Nic. can. 18.

to the orders and determinations resolved on in those assemblies, was deemed a schismatical, contentious, and contumacious person; with good reason, because he did thwart a discipline plainly conducible to public good; because declining such judgments he plainly showed that he would admit none, (there not being any fairer way of determining things, than by common advice and agreement of pastors;) because he did in effect refuse all good terms of communion and peace.

Thus, I conceive, the metropolitical governance was introduced, by human prudence following considerations of public necessity or utility. There are indeed some who think it was instituted by the Apostles: but their arguments do not seem convincing; and such a constitution doth not (as I take it) well suit to the state of their times, and the course they took in founding churches.

Into such a channel, through all parts of Christendom, (though with some petty differences in the methods and measures of acting,) had ecclesiastical administrations fallen of themselves; plain community of reason and imitation insensibly propagating that course; and therein it ran for a good time, before it was by general consent and solemn sanction established.

The whole Church then was a body consisting of several confederations of bishops, acting in behalf of their churches under their respective metropolitans, who did manage the common affairs in each province;* convoking synods at stated times and on emergent occasions; in them deciding causes and controversies incident, relating to faith or practice;† framing rules serviceable to common edification and decent uniformity in God's service; quashing heresies and schisms, declaring truths impugned or questioned; maintaining the harmony of communion and concord with other provinces adjacent or remote.

Such was the state of the Church, unto which the apostolical canons and constitutions do refer, answerable to the times in which they were framed; and which we may discern in the practice of ancient synods.

Such it did continue when the great synod of Nice was celebrated,‡ which by its authority, (presumed to represent the authority of all bishops in the world, who were summoned thereto,) backed by the imperial authority and power, did confirm those orders, as they found them standing by more

* Can. Apost. 38. &c. † Syn. Ant. can. 20.
‡ Syn. Constant. Theod. v. 9.

general custom and received rules in most provinces;* reducing them into more uniform practice; so that what before stood on reason, customary usage, particular consent, by so august sanction did become universal law; and did obtain so great veneration, as by some to be conceived everlastingly and immutably obligatory; according to those maxims of Pope Leo.

It is here farther observable, that whereas divers provinces did hold communion and intercourse; so that on occasion they did (by their formed letters) render to one another an account of their proceedings, being of great moment, especially of those which concerned the general state of Christianity and common faith; calling, when need was, for assistance one of another, to resolve points of faith, or to settle order and peace; there was in so doing a special respect given to the metropolites of great cities: and to prevent dissensions, which naturally ambition doth prompt men to, grounded on degrees of respect, an order was fixed among them, according to which in subscriptions of letters, in accidental congresses, and the like occasions, some should precede others; (that distinction being chiefly and commonly grounded on the greatness, splendor, opulency of cities; or following the secular dignity of them;) whence Rome had the first place, Alexandria the second, Antioch the third, Jerusalem the fourth, &c.

Afterward, Constantine having introduced a new partition of the empire,† whereby divers provinces were combined together into one territory, under the regiment of a vicar, or a lieutenant of a *præfectus-prætorio*, which territory was called a diocese; the ecclesiastical state was adapted in conformity thereto; new ecclesiastical systems, and a new sort of spiritual heads thence springing up; so that in each diocese, consisting of divers provinces, an ecclesiastical exarch‡ (otherwise sometimes called a primate, sometimes a diocesan,§ sometimes a patriarch,‖) was constituted, answerable to the civil exarch of a diocese; who by such constitution did obtain a like authority over the metropolitans of provinces, as they had in their province over the bishops of cities;¶ so that it appertained to them to call together the synods of the whole diocese, to preside in them, and in them to dispatch the principal affairs concerning that precinct,

* Can. 20. † Zos. lib. ii. p. 63.

‡ Syn. Chalc. Act. x. p. 388.

§ Epist. Orient. ad Rufum. in Syn. Eph p. 396. Dist. xcix. cap. 1. 2.

‖ Syn. Chalc. Act. 2. (p. 211.) Evag. iii. 6.

¶ Zon. ad 28. Can. Chalc. Novell. cxxxvii. cap. 5. et cxxiii. cap. 10. P. Greg. I. Ep. 11. 56. Isid. Dist. xxi. cap. 1.

to ordain metropolitans, to confirm the ordinations of bishops, to decide causes and controversies between bishops on appeal from provincial synods.

Some conceive the synod of Nice did establish it; but that can hardly well be; for that synod was held about the time of that division, (after that Constantine was settled in a peaceful enjoyment of the empire,) and scarce could take notice of so fresh a change in the state; that doth not pretend to innovate, but professeth in its sanctions specially to regard ancient custom, saving to the churches their privileges of which they were possessed;* that only mentioneth provinces, and representeth the metropolitans in them as the chief governors ecclesiastical then being; that constituteth a peremptory decision of weighty causes in provincial synods, which is inconsistent with the diocesan authority; that taketh no notice of Constantinople, the principal diocese in the east, as seat of the empire;† (and the synod of Antioch, insisting in the footsteps of the Nicene, doth touch only metropolitans, (can. 19.) and the synod of Laodicea doth only suppose that order.) In fine, that synod is not recorded by any old historian to have framed such an alteration; which indeed was so considerable, that Eusebius, who was present there, could not well have passed it over in silence.

Of this opinion was the synod of Carthage, in their Epistle to Pope Celestine I. who understood no jurisdiction but that of metropolitans to be constituted in the Nicene synod.

Some think the Fathers of the second general synod did introduce it, seeing it expedient that ecclesiastical administrations should correspond to the political; for they did innovate somewhat in the form of government; they do expressly use the new word diocese, according to the civil sense, as distinct from a province; they do distinctly name the particular dioceses of the oriental empire, as they stood in the civil establishment; they do prescribe to the bishops in each diocese to act unitedly there, not skipping over the bounds of it; they order a kind of appeal to the synod of the diocese, prohibiting other appeals: the historians expressly do report of them, that they did distinguish and distribute dioceses, that they did constitute patriarchs, that they did prohibit that any of one diocese should intrude on another.‡

But if we shall attently search and scan passages, we may perhaps find reason to judge that this form did soon after the

* Can. 18. 6. 7. † Syn. Laod. can. 12.
‡ Syn. Const. can. 6. Theod. v. 9. Socr. v. 8.

synod of Nice creep in, without any solemn appointment, by spontaneous assumption and submission, accommodating things to the political course; the great bishops (who by the amplification of their city, in power, wealth, and concourse of people, were advanced in reputation and interest) assuming such authority to themselves; and the lesser bishops easily complying: and of this we have some arguments. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, being deposed and extruded by Acacius, metropolitan of Palestine, did appeal to a greater judicatory;* being the first (as Socrates noteth) who ever did use that course; because, it seemeth, there was no greater in being till about that time; which was some years before the synod of Constantinople; in which there is mention of a greater synod of the diocese—.

There was a convention of bishops of the Pontic diocese at Tyana,† (distinguished from the Asian bishops,) whereof Eusebius of Cæsarea is reckoned, in the first place, as president, in the time of Valens.

Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, is said by the synod of Chalcedon to have presided in the synod of Constantinople.‡

A good argument is drawn from the very canon of the synod of Constantinople itself;§ which doth speak concerning bishops over dioceses, as already constituted, or extant; not instituting that order of bishops, but supposing it, and together with an implicit confirmation regulating practice according to it, by prohibiting bishops to leap over the bounds of their diocese, so as to meddle in the affairs of other dioceses; and by ordering appeals to the synod of a diocese.

Of authority gained by such assumption and concession, without law, there might be produced divers instances.

As particularly that the see of Constantinople did assume to itself ordination, and other acts of jurisdiction, in three dioceses, before any such power was granted to it by any synodical decree; the which to have done divers instances show: some whereof are alleged in the synod of Chalcedon;‖ as St. Chrysostom, of whom it is there said, "that going into Asia he deposed fifteen bishops, and consecrated others in their room."¶

He also deposed Gerontius, bishop of Nicomedia, belonging to the diocese of Pontus.

Whence the Fathers of Chalcedon did aver "that they had in a synod confirmed the ancient custom which the holy church

* Socr. ii. 40. † Soz. vi. 12.
‡ (In prosphonetico ad Imper.) § Can. 2. 6.
‖ Syn. Chalc. Act. xvi. (p. 463.) ¶ Ibid. xi. (p. 411.)

of God in Constantinople had, to ordain metropolitans in the Asian, Pontic, and Thracian dioceses."*

The which custom (consistent with reason, and becoming the dignity of the empire, and grateful to the court) that great synod did establish, although the Roman Church, out of jealousy, did contest and protest against it.†

But the most pertinent instances are those of the Roman, Alexandrine, and Antiochene churches, having by degrees assumed to themselves such power over divers provinces; in imitation of which churches the other diocesan bishops may well be thought to have enlarged their jurisdiction.

This form of government is intimated in the synod of Ephesus, by those words in which dioceses and provinces are distinguished; "and the same shall be observed in all dioceses and all provinces every where."‡

However that this form of discipline was perfectly settled in the times of the fourth general synod is evident by two notable canons thereof, wherein it is decreed that "if any bishop have a controversy with his metropolitan of his province, he shall resort to and be judged by the exarch of the diocese, or by the see of Constantinople."§

This was a great privilege conferred on the bishop of Constantinople; the which perhaps did ground (to be sure it did make way for) the plea of that bishop to the title of Œcumenical Patriarch, or Universal Bishop, which Pope Gregory did so exagitate; and indeed it soundeth so fairly toward it, that the Pope hath nothing comparable to it, to allege in favor of his pretences; this being the decree of the greatest synod that ever was held among the ancients, where all the patriarchs did concur in making these decrees; which Pope Gregory did reverence as one of the gospels. If any ancient synod did ever constitute any thing like to universal monarchy, it was this; wherein a final determination of greatest causes was granted to the see of Constantinople, without any exception or reservation: I mean as to semblance and the sound of words: for as to the true sense, I do indeed conceive that the canon did only relate to causes emergent in the eastern parts; and probably it did only respect the three dioceses (of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace) which were immediately subjected to his patriarchal jurisdiction.

Pope Nicholas I. doth very jocularly expound this canon;

* Syn. Chalc. in Epist. ad P. Leonem.

† Syn. Chalc. Act. xvi. (p. 462.—)

‡ Syn. Eph. can. 8. [There is mention of dioceses in Strabo.]

§ Syn. Chalc. can. 19. 17.

affirming that by the primate of the diocese is understood the Pope, (diocese being put by a notable figure for dioceses,) and that an appeal is to be made to the bishop of Constantinople, only by permission, in case the party will be content therewith.*

We may note that some provincial churches were by ancient custom exempted from dependence on any primacy or patriarchate.

Such an one the Cyprian church was adjudged to be in the Ephesine synod; wherein the privileges of such churches were confirmed against the invasion of greater churches, and to that purpose this general law enacted; "Let the same be observed in all dioceses and provinces every where—that none of the bishops most beloved of God invade another province, which did not formerly belong to him or his predecessors; and if any one have invaded one, and violently seized it, that he restore it."†

Such a Church was that of Britain anciently, before Austin did introduce the papal authority here, against that canon; as by divers learned pens hath been showed.

Such was the Church of Afric, as by their canons against transmarine appeals, and about all other matters, doth appear.

It is supposed by some that discipline was screwed yet one peg higher, by setting up the order of patriarchs higher than primates or diocesan exarchs: but I find no ground of this supposal except in one case; that is, of the bishop of Constantinople being set above the bishops of Ephesus, Cæsarea, and Heraclea, which were the primates of the three dioceses.

It is a notable fib which Pope Nicholas II. telleth, as Gratian citeth him; "That the Church of Rome instituted all patriarchal supremacies, all metropolitan primacies, episcopal sees, all ecclesiastical orders and dignities whatsoever."‡

Now things standing thus in Christendom, we may, concerning the interest of the Roman bishop, in reference to them, observe,

1. In all these transactions about modelling the spiritual discipline, there was no canon established any peculiar jurisdiction to the bishop of Rome, only the

2. Synod of Nice did suppose that he by custom did enjoy some authority within certain precincts of the west, like to that which it did confirm to the bishop of Alexandria in Egypt, and the countries adjacent thereto.

3. The synods of Constantinople did allow him honorary

* P. Nich. I. Ep. 8. (p. 507.) † Conc. Eph. can. 8.
‡ P. Nic. II. Dist. xxii. cap. 1.

privileges, or precedence before all other bishops, assigning the next place after him to the bishop of Constantinople.

4. In other privileges the synod of Chalcedon did equal the see of Constantinople to the Roman.

5. The canons of the two first and fourth general synods, ordering all affairs to be dispatched, and causes to be determined in metropolitan or diocesan synods, do exclude the Roman bishop from meddling in those concerns.

6. The Popes (out of a humor natural to them, to like nothing but what they did themselves, and which served their interests) did not relish those canons, although enacted by synods which themselves admitted for œcumenical. "That subscription of some bishops made above sixty years since, as you boast, does no whit favor your persuasion; a subscription never transmitted to the knowlege of the apostolic see by your predecessors, which from its very beginning being weak, and long since ruinous, you endeavor now too late and unprofitably to revive." *

So doth Pope Leo I. treat the second great synod, writing to Anatolius; and Gregory speaking of the same says, "that the Roman Church has not the acts of that synod, nor received its canons."†

7. Wherefore in the west they did obtain no effect, so as to establish diocesan primacies there.

The bishops of cities, which were heads of dioceses, either did not know of these canons, (which is probable, because Rome did smother the notice of them,) or were hindered from using them; the Pope having so winded himself in, and got such hold among them, as he would not let go.‡

8. It indeed turned to a great advantage of the Pope, in carrying on his encroachments, and enlarging his worldly interests, that the western churches did not, as the eastern, conform themselves to the political frame in embracing diocesan primacies; which would have engaged and enabled them better

* P. Leo. Ep. 53. (ad Anatol.) Vid. Ep. 54. 55. 61.

† Greg. M. Ep. vi. 31. (ad Eulog. Alex.)

‡ N. B. A Roman synod, anno 378. consisting of Italian bishops, did give the Pope such a privilege as the synod of Constantinople did to the bishop of that see. (Marc. de Prima. p. 103. ex App. Cod. Thodos. Vide Baron.)

But there is difference between a general synod and an Italian synod: and what had an Italian synod to prescribe to all the provinces of the Roman empire, or rather of the west? P. Greg. I. Ep. 7. 8.

to protect the liberties of their churches from papal invasions.*

9. For hence, for want of a better, the Pope did claim to himself a patriarchal authority over the western churches; pretending a right of calling synods, of meddling in ordinations, of determining causes by appeal to him; of dictating laws and rules to them, against the old rights of metropolitans, and the later constitutions for primacies.

Of this we have an instance in St. Gregory; where he alleging an imperial constitution importing that in case a clergyman should appeal from his metropolitan, "the cause should be referred to the archbishop and patriarch of that diocese, who judging according to the canons and laws should give an end thereto;" doth consequentially assume an appeal from a bishop to himself, adjoining, "If against these things it be said that the bishop had neither metropolitan nor patriarch, it is to be said that this cause was to be heard and decided by the apostolical see, which is the head of all churches."†

10. Having got such advantage, and, as to extent, stretched his authority beyond the bounds of his sub-urbicarian precincts, he did also intend it in quality far beyond the privileges by any ecclesiastical law granted to patriarchs, or claimed or exercised by any other patriarch; till at length, by degrees, he had advanced it to an exorbitant omnipotency, and thereby utterly enslaved the western churches.

The ancient order did allow a patriarch or primate to call a synod of the bishops in his diocese, and with them to determine ecclesiastical affairs by majority of suffrages: but he doth not do so; but setting himself down in his chair, with a few of his courtiers about him, doth make decrees and dictates, to which he pretendeth all must submit.

The ancient order did allow a patriarch to ordain metropolitans duly elected in their dioceses; leaving bishops to be ordained by the metropolitans in their provincial synods: but he will meddle in the ordination of every bishop, suffering none to be constituted without his confirmation, for which he must soundly pay.

The ancient order did allow a patriarch, with the advice and consent of his synod, to make canons for the well-ordering his

* Balusius thinketh that Hilarius of Arles did pretend and offer at this primatical power, apud Marc. v. 32. but Pope Leo did mainly check and quash his attempt.

† Greg. I. Ep. xi. 56.

diocese: but he sendeth about his Decretal Letters, composed by an infallible secretary, which he pretendeth must have the force of laws, equal to the highest decrees of the whole Church.

The ancient order did suppose bishops by their ordination sufficiently obliged to render unto their patriarch due observance, according to the canons, he being liable to be judged in a synod for the transgression of his duty; but he forceth all bishops to take the most slavish oaths of obedience to him that can be imagined.

The ancient order did appoint that bishops accused for offences should be judged in their provinces; or, on appeal from them, in patriarchal synods: but he receiveth appeals at the first hand, and determineth them in his court, without calling such a synod in an age for any such purpose.

The ancient patriarchs did order all things, as became good subjects, with leave and under submission to the emperor, who as he pleased did interpose his confirmation of their sanctions: but this man pretendeth to decree what he pleaseth without the leave, and against the will of princes.

Wherefore he is not a patriarch of the western churches, (for that he acteth according to no patriarchal rule,) but a certain kind of sovereign lord, or a tyrannical oppressor of them.

11. In all the transactions for modelling the Church,* there never was allowed to the Pope any dominion over his fellow-patriarchs, or of those great primates who had assumed that name to themselves; among whom indeed, for the dignity of his city, he had obtained a priority of honor or place; but never had any power over them settled by a title of law, or by clear and uncontested practice.

Insomuch, that if any of them had erred in faith, or offended in practice, it was requisite to call a general synod to judge them; as in the cases of Athanasius, of Gregory Nazianzen and Maximus, of Theophilus and St. Chrysostom, of Nestorius and of Dioscorus, is evident.

12. Indeed all the oriental churches did keep themselves pretty free from his encroachments, although, when he had swollen so big in the west, he sometimes did take occasion to attempt on their liberty; which they sometimes did warily decline, sometimes stoutly did oppose.

But as to the main, those flourishing churches constantly did maintain a distinct administration from the western churches,† under their own patriarchs and synods, not suffering him to interlope in prejudice to their liberty.

* Isid. in. Dist. 21. cap. 1. † Vid. de Marc. lib. vii. cap. 4. 5.

They, without his leave or notice, did call and celebrate synods, (whereof all the first great synods are instances;) their ordinations were not confirmed or touched by him; appeals were not (with public regard or allowance) thence made to him in causes great or little, but they decided them among themselves: they quashed heresies springing up among them, as the Second General Synod the Macedonians, Theophilus the Origenists, &c. Little in any case had his worship to do with them, or they with him, beyond what was needful to maintain general communion and correspondence with him; which they commonly, as piety obliged, were willing to do.

And sometimes, when a pert Pope, on some incidental advantage of differences risen among them, would be more busy than they deemed convenient in tampering with their affairs, they did rap his fingers: so Victor, so Stephanus, so Julius and Liberius, of old did feel to their smart: so afterwards Damasus and other Popes in the case of Flavianus; Innocent in the case of St. Chrysostom; Felix and his successors in the case of Acacius, did find little regard had to their interposals.

So things proceeded, till at length a final rupture was made between them, and they would not suffer him at all to meddle with their affairs.

Before I proceed any farther, I shall briefly draw some corollaries from this historical account which I have given of the original and growth of metropolitical, primatical, and patriarchal jurisdiction.

1. Patriarchs are an human institution.

2. As they were erected by the power and prudence of men, so they may be dissolved by the same.

3. They were erected by the leave and confirmation of princes; and by the same they may be dejected, if great reason do appear.

4. The patriarchate of the Pope beyond his own province or diocese doth not subsist on any canon of a general synod.

5. He can therefore claim no such power otherwise than on his invasion or assumption.

6. The primates and metropolitans of the western church cannot be supposed otherwise than by force, or out of fear, to have submitted to such an authority as he doth usurp.

7. It is not really a patriarchal power, (like to that which was granted by the canons and princes,) but another sort of power, which the Pope doth exercise.

8. The most rightful patriarch, holding false doctrine, or imposing unjust laws, or tyrannically abusing his power, may and ought to be rejected from communion.

9. Such a patriarch is to be judged by a free synod, if it may be had.

10. If such a synod cannot be had by consent of princes, each church may free itself from the mischiefs induced by his perverse doctrine or practice.

11. No ecclesiastical power can interpose in the management of any affairs within the territory of any prince without his concession.

12. By the laws of God, and according to ancient practice, princes may model the bounds of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, erect bishoprics, enlarge, diminish, or transfer them as they please.

13. Wherefore each prince (having supreme power in his own dominions, and equal to what the emperor had in his) may exclude any foreign prelate from jurisdiction in his territories.

14. It is expedient for peace and public good, that he should do thus.

15. Such prelate, according to the rules of Christianity, ought to be content with his doing so.

16. Any prelate, exercising power in the dominion of any prince, is *eatenus* his subject; as the Popes and all bishops were to the Roman emperors.

17. Those joints of ecclesiastical discipline, established in the Roman empire by the confirmation of emperors, were (as to necessary continuance) dissolved by the dissolution of the Roman empire.

18. The power of the Pope in the territories of any prince did subsist by his authority and favor.

19. By the same reason as princes have curbed the exorbitancy of Papal power in some cases (of entertaining legates, making appeals, disposing of benefices, &c.) by the same they might exclude it.

20. The practice of Christianity doth not depend on the subsistence of such a form instituted by man.

Having showed at large that this universal sovereignty and jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome over the Christian Church hath no real foundation either in Scripture or elsewhere, it will be requisite to show by what ways and means so groundless a claim and pretence should gain belief and submission to it from so considerable a part of Christendom; and that from so very slender roots (from slight beginnings, and the slimmest pretences one can well imagine) this bulk of exorbitant power did grow, the vastest that ever man on earth did attain, or did ever aim at, will be the less wonderful, if we do consider the

many causes which did concur and contribute thereto; some whereof are proposed in the following observations.

1. Eminency of any kind (in wealth, in honor, in reputation, in might, in place, or mere order of dignity,) doth easily pass into advantages of real power and command over those who are inferior in those respects, and have any dealings or common transactions with such superiors.

For to persons endowed with such eminency by voluntary deference the conduct of affairs is wont to be allowed; none presuming to stand in competition with them, every one rather yielding place to them than to their equals.

The same conduct of things, on the same accounts, and by reason of their possession, doth continue fast in their hands, so long as they do retain such advantages.

Then from a custom of managing things doth spring up an opinion or a pretence of right thereto; they are apt to assume a title, and others ready to allow it.

Men naturally do admire such things, and so are apt to defer extraordinary respect to the possessors of them.

Advantages of wealth and might are not only instruments to attain, but incentives spurring men to affect the getting authority over their poorer and weaker neighbors; for men will not be content with bare eminency, but will desire real power and sway, so as to obtain their wills over others, and not to be crossed by any. Pope Leo had no reason to wonder that Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, was not content with dry honor. Men are apt to think their honor is precarious, and standeth on an uncertain foundation, if it be not supported with real power; and therefore they will not be satisfied to let their advantages lie dead, which are so easily improvable to power, by inveigling some, and scaring or constraining others to bear their yoke; and they are able to benefit and gratify some, and thereby render them willing to submit; those afterwards become serviceable to bring others under, who are disaffected or refractory.

So the bishops of Constantinople and of Jerusalem, at first, had only privileges of honor; but afterward they soon hooked in power.

Now the Roman bishops from the beginning were eminent above all other bishops in all kinds of advantages.

He was seated in the imperial city, the place of general resort; thence obvious to all eyes, and his name sounding in all mouths. He had a most numerous, opulent, splendid flock and clergy. He had the greatest income (from liberal oblations) to

dispose of. He lived in greatest state and lustre. He had opportunities to assist others in their business, and to relieve them in their wants. He necessarily thence did obtain great respect and veneration. Hence in all common affairs the conduct and presidence were naturally devolved on him, without contest.

No wonder then, that after some time the Pope did arrive to some pitch of authority over poor Christians, especially those who lay nearest to him; improving his eminency into power, and his pastoral charge into a kind of empire; according to that observation of Socrates, that "long before his time the Roman episcopacy had advanced itself beyond the priesthood into a potentacy."*

And the like he observeth to have happened in the church of Alexandria, on the like grounds, or by imitation of such a pattern.

2. Any small power is apt to grow and spread itself; a spark of it soon will expand itself into a flame: it is very like to 'the grain of mustard seed, which indeed is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.' "Encroaching," as Plutarch saith, "is an innate disease of potentacies."† Whoever hath any pittance of it, will be improving his stock; having tasted the sweetness of having his will, (which extremely gratifieth the nature of man,) he will not be satisfied without having more; he will take himself to be straitened by any bounds; and will strive to free himself of all restraints.

Any pretence will serve to ground attempts of enlarging power, and none will be balked. For power is bold, enterprising, restless: it always watcheth, or often findeth, "never passeth opportunities of dilating itself." Every accession doth beget farther advantages to amplify it; as its stock groweth, so it with ease proportionably doth increase; being ever out at use. As it groweth, so its strength to maintain and enlarge itself doth grow; it gaining more wealth, more friends, more associates and dependents.

None can resist or obstruct its growth without danger and manifold disadvantages: for as its adherents are deemed loyal and faithful, so its opposers are branded with the imputations of rebellion, contumacy, disloyalty; and not succeeding in their resistance, they will be undone.

None ever doth enterprise more than to stop its career; so

* Socr. vii. 11. † Plut. in Pyrrh.

that it seldom loseth by opposition; and it ever gaineth by composition. If it be checked at one time, or in one place, it will, like the sea, at another season, in another point, break in. If it is sometimes overthrown in a battle, it is seldom conquered in the war.

It is always on its march forward, and gaineth ground; for one encroachment doth countenance the next, and is alleged for a precedent to authorise or justify it. It seldom moveth backward; for every successor thinketh he may justly enjoy what his predecessor did gain, or which is transmitted into his possession; so that there hardly can ever be any restitution of ill-gotten power.

Thus have many absolute kingdoms grown; the first chief was a leader of volunteers; from thence he grew to be a prince with stated privileges; after, he became a monarch invested with high prerogatives; in fine, he creepeth forward to be a grand seignior, usurping absolute dominion: so did Augustus Cæsar first only assume the style of prince of the senate, demeaning himself modestly as such: but he soon drew to himself the administration of all things; and on that foundation his successors very suddenly did erect a boundless power. If you trace the footsteps of most empires to the beginning, you may perceive the like.

So the Pope, when he had got a little power, continually did swell it. The puny pretence of the succeeding St. Peter, and the name of the apostolical see; the precedence, by reason of the imperial city; the honorary privileges allowed him by councils; the authority deferred to him by one synod of revising the causes of bishops; the countenance given to him in repressing some heresies, he did improve to constitute himself sovereign lord of the Church.

3. Spiritual power especially is of a growing nature, and more especially that which deriveth from divine institution: for it hath a great awe on the hearts and consciences of men; which engageth them to a firm and constant adherence. It useth the most subtle arms, which it hath always ready, which needeth no time or cost to furnish, which cannot be extorted from its hand; so that it can never be disarmed. And its weapons make strong impression, because it proposeth the most effectual encouragements to its abettors, and discouragements to its adversaries: alluring the one with promises of God's favor and eternal happiness, terrifying the other with menaces of vengeance from heaven, and endless misery: the which do ever quell religious, superstitious, weak people; and often daunt men of knowlege and courage.

It is presumed unchangeable and unextinguishable by any human power, and thence is not (as all other power) subject to revolutions. Hence, like Achilles, it is hardly vincible, because almost immortal. If it be sometimes rebuffed or impaired, it soon will recover greater strength and vigor.

The Popes derive their authority from divine institution; and their weapons always are sentences of Scripture: they pretend to dispense remission of sins, and promise heaven to their abettors. They excommunicate, curse, and damn the opposers of their designs.

They pretend they never can lose any power that ever did belong to their see: they are always stiff, and they never recede or give back. "The privileges of the Roman Church can sustain no detriment."*

4. Power is easily attained and augmented on occasion of dissensions. Each faction usually doth make itself a head, the chief in strength and reputation which it can find inclinable to favor it; and that head it will strive to magnify, that he may be the abler to promote its cause; and if the cause doth prosper, he is rewarded with accession of privileges and authority: especially those who were oppressed, and find relief by his means, do become zealously active for his aggrandisement.

Thus usually in civil broils the captain of the prevalent party groweth a prince, or is crowned with great privileges, (as Cæsar, Octavian, Cromwell, &c.)

So on occasion of the Arian faction, and the oppression of Athanasius, Marcellus, Paulus, and other bishops, the Pope (who by their application to him had occasion to head the Catholic party) did grow in power; for thereon the Sardican synod did decree to him that privilege, which he infinitely enhanced, and which became the main engine of rearing himself so high.

And by his interposal in the dissensions raised by the Nestorians, the Pelagians, the Eutychians, the Acacians, the Monothelites, the Image-worshippers, and Image-breakers, &c. his authority was advanced; for he, adhering in those causes to the prevailing party, was by them extolled, obtaining both reputation and sway.

5. All power is attended by dependences of persons sheltered under it, and by it enjoying subordinate advantages; the which proportionably do grow by its increase.

Such persons therefore will ever be inciting their chief and patron to amplify his power; and in aiding him to compass it,

* P. Nic. I. Ep. xxxvi. (32——.)

they will be very industriously, resolutely, and steadily active, their own interest moving them thereto.

Wherefore their mouths will ever be open in crying him up, their heads will be busy in contriving ways to further his interests, their care and pains will be employed in accomplishing his designs; they with their utmost strength will contend in his defence against all oppositions.

Thus the Roman clergy first, then the bishops of Italy, then all the clergy of the west, became engaged to support, to fortify, to enlarge the papal authority; they all sharing with him in domination over the laity; and enjoying wealth, credit, support, privileges, and immunities thereby. Some of them especially were ever putting him on higher pretences; and furthering him by all means in his acquist and maintenance of them.

6. Hence if a potentate himself should have no ambition, nor much ability to improve his power; yet it would of itself grow, he need only be passive therein; the interest of his partisans would effect it: so that often power doth no less thrive under sluggish and weak potentates, especially if they are void of goodness, than under the most active and able: let the ministers alone to drive on their interest.

7. Even persons otherwise just and good do seldom scruple to augment their power by undue encroachment, or at least to uphold the usurpations of their foregoers: for even such are apt to favor their own pretences, and afraid of incurring censure and blame, if they should part with any thing left them by their predecessors. They apprehend themselves to owe a dearness to their place, engaging them to tender its own weal and prosperity, in promoting which they suppose themselves not to act for their own private interest; and that it is not out of ambition or avarice, but out of a regard to the grandeur of their office, that they stickle and bustle; and that in so doing they imitate St. Paul, who did 'magnify his office.' They are encouraged hereto by the applause of men, especially of those who are allied with them in interest, and who converse with them; who take it for a maxim, *Boni principis est ampliare imperium:* the extenders of empire are admired and commended, however they do it, although with cruel wars, or by any unjust means.

Hence usually the worthiest men in the world's eye are greatest enlargers of power; and such men bringing appearances of virtue, ability, reputation to aid their endeavors, do most easily compass designs of this nature, finding less obstruction to their attempts; for men are not so apt to suspect their integrity, or to charge them with ambition and avarice; and the

few who discern their aims and consequences of things, are overborne by the number of those who are favorably conceited and inclined toward them.

Thus Julius I. Damasus I. Innocent I. Gregory I. and the like Popes, whom history representeth as laudable persons, did yet confer to the advancement of papal grandeur. But they who did most advance that interest, as Pope Leo I. Gelasius I. Pope Nicholas I. Pope Gregory VII. in the esteem of true zealots, pass for the best Popes. Hence the distinction between a good man, a good prince, a good Pope.

8. Men of an inferior condition are apt to express themselves highly in commendation of those who are in a superior rank, especially on occasion of address and intercourse; which commendations are liable to be interpreted for acknowlegements or attestations of right, and thence do sometimes prove means of creating it.

Of the generality of men it is truly said, that it "doth fondly serve fame, and is stunned with titles and images;" readily ascribing to superiors whatever they claim, without scanning the grounds of their title. Simple and weak men, out of abjectedness and fear, are wont to crouch, and submit to any thing on any terms. Wise men do not love brangling, nor will expose their quiet and safety without great reason; thence being inclinable to comply with greater persons. Bad men, out of design to procure advantages or impunity, are prone to flatter and gloze with them. Good men, out of due reverence to them, and in hope of fair usage from them, are ready to compliment them, or treat them with the most respectful terms. Those who are obliged to them will not spare to extol them; paying the easy return of good words for good deeds.

Thus all men conspire to exalt power; the which snatcheth all good words as true, and construeth them to the most favorable sense; and allegeth them as verdicts and arguments of unquestionable right. So are the compliments, or terms of respect, used by Jerome, Austin, Theodoret, and divers others, toward Popes, drawn into an argument for papal authority; whenas the actions of such Fathers, and their discourses on other occasions, do manifest their serious judgment to have been directly contrary to his pretences: wherefore the emperor of Constantinople, in the Florentine synod, had good reason to decline such sayings for arguments, for, "If," saith he, "any of the saints doth in an epistle honor the Pope, shall he take that as importing privileges?"*

* Syn. Flor. Sess. xxv. (p. 848.)

9. Good men commonly (out of charitable simplicity, meekness, modesty, and humility, love of peace, and averseness from contention) are apt to yield to the encroachments of those who anywise do excel them; and when such men do yield, others are ready to follow their example. Bad men have little interest to resist, and no heart to stand for public good; but rather strike in presently, taking advantage by their compliance to drive a good market for themselves. Hence so many of all sorts in all times did comply with Popes, or did not obstruct them; suffering them without great obstacle to raise their power.

10. If in such cases a few wise men do apprehend the consequences of things, yet they can do little to prevent them. They seldom have the courage with sufficient zeal to bustle against encroachments; fearing to be overborne by its stream, to lose their labor, and vainly to suffer by it: if they offer at resistance, it is usually faint and moderate: whereas power doth act vigorously, and push itself forward with mighty violence; so that it is not only difficult to check it, but dangerous to oppose it.

Ambiguity of words (as it causeth many debates, so) yieldeth much advantage to the foundation and amplification of power:* for whatever is said of it, will be interpreted in favor of it, and will afford color to its pretences. Words innocently or carelessly used are by interpretation extended to signify great matters, or what you please. For instance,

The word *bishop* may import any kind of superintendency or inspection: hence St. Peter came to be reckoned bishop of Rome, because in virtue of his apostolical office he had inspection over that church founded by him, and might exercise some episcopal acts.

The word *head* doth signify any kind of eminency;† the word *prince*, any priority; the word to *preside*, any kind of superiority or preeminence: hence some Fathers attributing those names to St. Peter, they are interpreted to have thought him sovereign in power over the Apostles. And because some did give like terms to the Pope, they infer his superiority in power over all bishops; notwithstanding such Fathers did express a contrary judgment.

The word *successor* may import any derivation of power: hence because St. Peter is said to have founded the church of Rome, and to have ordained the first bishop there, the Pope is called his successor.

* Tertull. de Resur. Carn. 54. † Can. Apost. 34.

The word *authority* doth often import any kind of influence on the opinions or actions of men, (grounded on eminence of place, worth, reputation, or any such advantage:) hence because the Pope of old sometimes was desired to interpose his authority, they will understand him to have had right to command or judge in such cases; although authority is sometimes opposed to command, as where Livy saith, that "Evander did hold those places by authority, rather than by command;"* and Tacitus of the German princes saith, "They are heard rather according to their authority of persuading, than power of commanding."† "The word judge (saith Canus) is frequently used to signify no more than, I do think or conceive;"‡ whereby he doth excuse divers Popes from having decreed a notable error; (for Alexander III. says of them, "That they judged, that after a matrimony contracted, not consummated, another may be valid, that being dissolved.") Yet if the Pope is said to have judged so or so in any case, it is alleged for a certain argument of proper jurisdiction.

11. There is a strange enchantment in words; which being (although with no great color of reason) assumed, do work on the fancies of men, especially of the weaker sort. Of these power doth ever arrogate to itself such as are most operative, by their force sustaining and extending itself.

So divers prevalent factions did assume to themselves the name of *Catholic;* and the Roman church particularly hath appropriated that word to itself, even so as to commit a bull, implying Rome and the universe to be the same place; and the perpetual canting of this term hath been one of its most effectual charms to weak people: "I am a Catholic," that is, "an Universal; therefore all I hold is true:" this is their great argument.

The words *successor of Peter, apostolic see, prima sedes,* have been strongly urged for arguments of papal authority; the which have beyond their true force (for indeed they signify nothing) had a strange efficacy on men of understanding and wisdom.

12. The Pope's power was much amplified by the importunity of persons condemned or extruded from their places, whether on just accounts, or wrongfully, and by faction; for they finding no other more hopeful place of refuge and redress, did often apply to him:§ for what will not men do, whither will not they go in straits?

* Liv. 1. † Tac. de Mor. Ger. (p. 640.)
‡ Can. loc. vi. cap. 8. (Comp. lib. vi. 1.)
§ Rothaldi Appell. (in P. Nich. I. Ep. xxxvii. p. 563.)

Thus did Marcion go to Rome, and sue for admission to communion there. So Fortunatus and Felicissimus in St. Cyprian,* being condemned in Afric, did fly to Rome for shelter; of which absurdity St. Cyprian doth so complain. So likewise Martianus and Basilides, in St. Cyprian, being outed of their sees, for having lapsed from the Christian profession, did fly to Stephen for succor, to be restored. So Maximus (the Cynic) went to Rome, to get a confirmation of his election at Constantinople. So Marcellus, being rejected for heterodoxy, went thither to get attestation to his orthodoxy, (of which St. Basil complaineth.) So Apiarius, being condemned in Afric for his crimes, did appeal to Rome.

† And on the other side, Athanasius being with great partiality condemned by the Synod of Tyre; Paulus and other bishops being extruded from their sees for orthodoxy; St. Chrysostom being condemned, and expelled by Theophilus and his complices; Flavianus being deposed by Dioscorus and the Ephesine Synod; Theodoret being condemned by the same —did cry out for help to Rome.‡ Chelidonius, bishop of Resanon, being deposed by Hilarius of Arles, (for crimes,) did fly to Pope Leo. Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, being extruded from his see by Photius, did complain to the Pope.

13. All princes are forward to heap honor on the bishop of their imperial city; it seeming a disgrace to themselves, that so near a relation be an inferior to any other; who is, as it were, their spiritual pastor, who is usually by their special favor advanced. The city itself, and the court, will be restless in assisting him to climb.

Thus did the bishop of Constantinople arise to that high pitch of honor, and to be second patriarch; who at first was a mean suffragan to the bishop of Heraclea: this by the Synods of Constantinople and Chalcedon is assigned for the reason of his advancement. And how ready the emperors were to promote the dignity of that bishop, we see by many of their edicts to that purpose; as particularly that of Leo.§

So, for the honor of their city, the emperors usually did favor the Pope, assisting him in the furtherance of his designs, and extending his privileges by their edicts at home, and letters to the eastern emperors, recommending their affairs.

So in the Synod of Chalcedon we have the letters of Valen-

* Cypr. Ep. 68.
† Calendion of Antioch, liber. cap. 18.
§ P. Leo. Ep. 89. Marc. v. 32. P. Nich. I. Ep. xxxviii. (p. 564.)
‖ Cod. lib. i. tit. 2. cap. 16.

tinian, together with those of Placidia and of Eudoxia, the empresses to Theodosius, in behalf of Pope Leo, for retractation of the Ephesine Synod; wherein they do express themselves engaged to maintain the honor of the Roman see; "Seeing that," saith Placidia, mother of Theodosius, "it becometh us in all things to preserve the honor and dignity of this chief city, which is the mistress of all others."*

So Pope Nicholas confesseth that the emperors had "extolled the Roman see with divers privileges, had enriched it with gifts, had enlarged it with benefits,"† (or benefices,) &c.

14. The Popes had the advantage of being ready at hand to suggest what they pleased to the court, and thereby to procure his edicts (directed or dictated by themselves) in their favor, for extending their power, or repressing any opposition made to their encroachments.

Baronius observeth that the bishops of Constantinople did use this advantage for their ends: for thus he reflecteth on the edict of the emperor Leo in favor of that see: "These things Leo; but questionless conceived in the words of Acacius, swelling with pride."‡

And no less unquestionably did the Popes conceive words for the emperor in countenance of their authority.

Such was that edict of Valentinian in favor of Leo against Hilarius, bishop of Arles,§ (in an unjust cause, as Binius confesseth,) who contested his authority to undo what was done in a Gallican Synod. And we may thank Baronius himself for this observation, "By this, reader, thou understandest, that when the emperors ordained laws concerning religion, they did it by transcribing and enacting the laws of the Church, on the admonition of the holy bishops requiring them to do their duty."‖ It was a notable edict, which Pope Hilarius alleged; "It was also decreed by the laws of Christian princes, that whatsoever the bishop of the apostolic see should on examination pronounce concerning churches and their governors, &c. should with reverence be received and strictly observed,"¶ &c.

Such edicts by crafty suggestions being at opportune times from easy and unwary princes procured, did hold, not being easily reversed: and the power which the Pope once had obtained by them, he would never part with; fortifying it by higher pretences of divine immutable right.

* Syn. Chalc. (p. 27.)
† P. Nich. I. Ep. viii. (p. 513.)
‡ Baron. ann. 473. §. 4.
§ Bin. ad P. Hill. Ep. 11. (p. 576.)
‖ Baron. ann. 458. §. 4.
¶ P. Hilarius, Ep. xi. (p. 576.)
** P. Nich. I. Ep. 36.

The emperor Gratian, having gotten the world under him, did order the churches to those who would communicate with Pope Damasus. This and the like countenances did bring credit and authority to the Roman see.

15. It is therefore no wonder that Popes, being seated in the metropolis of the western empire, (the head of all the Roman state,) should find interest sufficient to make themselves by degrees what they would be: for they not only surpassing the provincial bishops in wealth and repute, but having power in court, who dared to pull a feather with them, or to withstand their encroachments? What wise man would not rather bear much, than contest on such disadvantages, and without probable grounds of success?

16. Princes who favored them with such concessions, and abetted their undertakings, did not foresee what such increase of power in time would arise to; or suspect the prejudice thence done to imperial authority. They little thought that in virtue thereof Popes would check and mate princes, or would claim superiority over them: for the Popes at that time did behave and express themselves with modesty and respect to emperors.

17. Power once rooted doth find seasons and favorable junctures for its growth; the which it will be intent to embrace.

The confusions of things, the eruptions of barbarians, the straits of emperors, the contentions of princes, &c. did all turn to account for him; and in confusion of things he did snatch what he could to himself.

The declination and infirmity of the Roman empire gave him opportunity to strengthen his interests, either by closing with it, so as to gain somewhat by its concession; or by opposing it, so as to head a faction against it. As he often had opportunity to promote the designs of emperors and princes, so those did return to him increase of authority; so they trucked and bartered together. For when princes were in straits, or did need assistance (from his reputation at home) to the furtherance of their designs, or support of their interest in Italy, they were content to honor him, and grant what he desired: as in the case of Acacius, which had caused so long a breach, the emperor, to engage Pope Hormisdas, did consent to his will. And at the Florentine Synod, the emperor did bow to the Pope's terms, in hopes to get his assistance against the Turks.

When the eastern emperors, by his means chiefly, were driven out of Italy, he snatched a good part of it to himself, and set up for a temporal prince.

When princes did clash, he by yielding countenance to one

side, would be sure to make a good market for himself: for this pretended successor to the fisherman was really skilled to angle in troubled waters.

They have been the incendiaries of Christendom, the kindlers and fomentors of war; and would often stir up wars; and inclining to the stronger part, would share with the conqueror; as when he stirred up Charles against the Lombards. They would on spiritual pretence, be interposing in all affairs.

He did oblige princes by abetting their cause when it was unjust or weak; his spiritual authority satisfying their conscience: whence he was sure to receive good acknowlegement and recompense. As when he did allow Pepin's usurpation.

He pretended to dispose of kingdoms, and to constitute princes; reserving obeisance to himself. Gregory VII. granted to Robert Guislard Naples and Sicily, *beneficiario jure.* Innocent II. gave to Roger the title of king.

There is scarce any kingdom in Europe which he hath not claimed the sovereignty of, by some pretence or other. Princes sometime, for quiet sake, have desired the Pope's consent and allowance of things appertaining of right to themselves, whence the Pope took advantage to claim an original right of disposing such things.

The proceeding of the Pope on occasion of wars is remarkable: when he did enter league with a prince, to side with him in a war against another, he did covenant to prosecute the enemy with spiritual arms, (that is, with excommunications and interdicts,) engaging his confederates to use temporal arms. So making ecclesiastical censures tools of interest.

When princes were in difficulties, (by the mutinous disposition of princes, the emulation of antagonists,) he would, as served his interest, interpose; hooking in some advantage to himself.

In the tumults against our King John, he struck in, and would have drawn the kingdom to himself.

He would watch opportunity to quarrel with princes, on pretence they did intrench on his spiritual power: as about the point of the investiture of bishops, and receiving homage from them.

Gregory VII. did excommunicate	Hen. III. (an. 1076.)
Calixtus II. . . .	Hen. IV. (an. 1120.)
Adrian IV. . . .	Fred. (an. 1160.
Celestinus III. . . .	Hen. V. (an. 1195.)
Innocent III. . . .	Otho (an. 1219.)
Honorius III. and Gregory IX. }	Fred. II. (an. 1220.)
Innocent IV. in the Lugd. Conc. }	1245.)

18. The ignorance of times did him great service: for then all the little learning which was, being in his clients and factors, they could instil what they pleased into the credulous people. Then his dictates would pass for infallible oracles, and his decrees for inviolable laws: whence his veneration was exceedingly increased.

19. He was forward to support factious churchmen against princes, on pretence of spiritual interest and liberty. And usually by his importunity and arts getting the better in such contests, he thereby did much strengthen his authority.

20. He making himself the head of all the clergy, and carrying himself as its protector and patron, did engage thereby innumerable most able heads, tongues, and pens; who were devoted to maintain whatever he did, and had little else to do.

21. So great a party he cherished with exorbitant liberties, suffering none to rule over them, or touch them, beside himself.

22. He did found divers militias and bands of spiritual janisaries, to be combatants for his interests; who depending immediately on him, subsisting by his charters, enjoying exemptions by his authority from other jurisdictions, being sworn to a special obeisance of him, were entirely at his devotion, ready with all their might to advance his interests, and to maintain all the pretences of their patron and benefactor.

These had great sway among the people, on account of their religious guises and pretences to extraordinary heights of sanctimony, austerity, contempt of the world. And learning being mostly confined to them, they were the chief teachers and guides of Christendom; so that no wonder, if he did challenge and could maintain any thing by their influence.

They did cry up his power, as superior to all others. They did attribute to him titles strangely high, Vice-god, Spouse of the Church, &c. strange attributes of omnipotency, infallibility, &c.

23. Whereas wealth is a great sinew of power, he did invent divers ways of drawing great store thereof to himself.

But how many tricks did he proll money from all parts of Christendom? as by

Dispensations for marriage within degrees prohibited, or at uncanonical times;—for vows and oaths; for observance of fasts and abstinences; for pluralities and incompatible benefices, non-residences, &c.

Indulgences, and pardons, and freeing souls from the pains of purgatory.

Reservations, and provisions of benefices, not bestowed gratis.

Consecrated presents; Agnus Dei's, swords, roses, &c.

Confirmation of bishops; sending palls.*

Appeals to his court.

Tributes of Peter-pence, annates, tithes,—introduced on occasion of holy wars, and continued.

Playing fast and loose, tying knots, and undoing them for gain.

Sending legates to drain places of money.

Commutations of penance for money.

Inviting to pilgrimage at Rome.

Hooking in legacies. What a mass of treasure did all this come to! What a trade did he drive!

24. He did indeed easily, by the help of his mercenary divines, transform most points of divinity in accommodation to his interests of power, reputation, and gain.

25. Any pretence, how slender soever, will in time get some validity; being fortified by the consent of divers authors, and a current of suitable practice.

Any story serving the designs of a party will get credit by being often told, especially by writers bearing a semblance of gravity; whereof divers will never be wanting to abet a flourishing party.

26. The histories of some ages were composed only by the Pope's clients, friars and monks, and such people; which therefore are partial to him, addicted to his interests, and under awe of him.

For a long time none dared open his mouth to question any of his pretences, or reprehend his practices, without being called heretic, and treated as such.

27. Whereas the Pope had two sorts of opposites to subdue, temporal princes and bishops; his business being to overtop princes and to enslave all bishops, or to invade and usurp the rights of both; he used the help of each to compass his designs on the other; by the authority of princes oppressing bishops, and by the assistance of bishops mating princes.

28. When any body would not do as he would have them, he did incessantly clamor or whine, that "St. Peter was injured."†

29. The forgery of the Decretal Epistles (wherein the ancient Popes are made expressly to speak and act according to some of his highest pretences, devised long after their times, and which they never thought of, good men) did hugely conduce to his

* In the times of Henry I. the bishop of York did pay 10,000*l.* sterling for his pall. Matt. Par. (p. 274.)

† P. Nich. I. Ep. 37.

purpose; authorising his encroachments by the suffrage of ancient doctrine and practice: a great part of his Canon Law is extracted out of these, and grounded on them.

The donation of Constantine, fictitious acts of councils, and the like counterfeit stuff, did help thereto; the which were soon embraced, as we see in Pope Gregory II.—

As also legends, fables of miracles, and all such 'deceivableness of unrighteousness.'

30. Popes were so cunning as to form grants, and impute that to privileges derived from them, which princes did enjoy by right or custom.*

31. Synods of bishops called by him at opportune seasons, consisting of his votaries or slaves. None dared therein to whisper any thing to the prejudice of his authority. He carried whatever he pleased to propose, without check or contradiction. Who dared to question any thing done by such numbers of pastors, styling themselves the 'representative of Christendom?'

32. The having hampered all the clergy with strict oaths of universal obedience to him, (beginning about the times of Pope Gregory VII.) did greatly assure his power.

33. When intolerable oppressions and exactions did constrain princes to struggle with him, if he could not utterly prevail, things were brought to composition; whereby he was to be sure for that time a gainer, and gained establishment in some points, leaving the rest to be got afterward in more favorable junctures.

Witness the Concordates between	Henry II. and P. Alex. III. an. 1172. Edw. III. and P. Greg. XI. an. 1373. Henry V. and P. Mart. V. an. 1418.

34. When princes were fain to curb their exorbitances by 'pragmatical sanctions,' they were restless till they had got those sanctions revoked. And when they found weak princes, or any prince in circumstances advantaging their design, they did obtain their end. So Pope Leo X. got Lewis XI. to repeal the 'pragmatical sanctions' of his ancestors.

35. The power he did assume to absolve men from oaths and vows, to dispense with prohibited marriages, &c. did not only bring much grist to his mill, but did enable him highly to oblige divers persons (especially great ones) to himself. For to him they owed the quiet of their conscience from scruples; to him they owed the satisfaction of their desires, and legitimation of their issue, and title to their possessions.

* Twisd. p. 17.

36. So the device of indulgences did greatly raise the veneration of him: for who would not adore him, that could loose his bands, and free his soul from long and grievous pains?

SUPPOSITION VI.

The next Supposition is this, that in fact the Roman bishops continually from St. Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this sovereign power.

THIS is a question of fact, which will best be decided by a particular consideration of the several branches of sovereign power; that so we may examine the more distinctly whether in all ages the Popes have enjoyed and exercised them, or not.

And if we survey the particular branches of sovereignty, we shall find that the Pope had no just title to them, in reason, by valid law, or according to ancient practice; whence each of them doth yield a good argument against his pretences.

I. If the Pope were sovereign of the Church, he would have power to convocate its supreme councils and judicatories; and would constantly have exercised it.

This power therefore the Pope doth claim; and indeed did pretend to it a long time since, before they could obtain to exercise it: "It is manifestly apparent," saith Pope Leo X. with approbation of his Lateran synod, "that the Roman bishop for the time being (as who hath authority over all councils) hath alone the full right and power of indicting, translating, and dissolving councils:"* and long before him, "To the apostolical authority," said Pope Adrian I. "by our Lord's command, and by the merits of St. Peter, and by the decrees of the holy canons, and of the venerable Fathers, a right and special power of convocating synods hath manywise been committed:"† and yet before him, "The authority," saith Pope Pelagius II. "of convocating synods hath been delivered to the apostolical see by the singular privilege of St. Peter."‡

But it is manifest that the Pope cannot pretend to this power by virtue of any old ecclesiastical canons, none such being extant or produced by him; nor can he allege any ancient custom; there having been no general synod before Constantine: and as to the practice from that time, it is very clear that

* Con. Later. Sess. xi. (p. 152.) ann.

† P. Hadrian I. apud Bin. tom. v. p. 565. (ann. 785.)

‡ P. Pelag. II. Epist. 8. (Bin. tom. iv. p. 476.) ann. 587. Qu. An hæc Epistola sit Pelagii II.? Negat Launoius.

for some ages the Popes did not assume or exercise such a power, and that it was not taken for their due. Nothing can be more evident, and it were extreme impudence to deny, that the emperors, at their pleasure, and by their authority, did congregate all the first general synods; for so the oldest historians in most express terms do report, so those princes in their edicts did aver, so the synods themselves did declare. The most just and pious emperors, who did bear greatest love to the clergy, and had much respect for the Pope, did call them without scruple; it was deemed their right to do it, none did remonstrate against their practice; the fathers in each synod did refer thereto, with allowance, and commonly with applause; Popes themselves did not contest their right, yea commonly did petition them to exercise it.

These things are so clear and so obvious, that it is almost vain to prove them; I shall therefore but touch them.

In general Socrates doth thus attest to the ancient practice; "We," saith he, "do continually include the emperors in our history, because on them, ever since they became Christians, ecclesiastical affairs have depended, and the greatest synods have been and are made by their appointment:"* and Justinian in his prefatory type to the fifth general council beginneth thus; "It hath been ever the care of pious and orthodox emperors, by the assembling of the most religious bishops, to cut off heresies, as they did spring up; and by the right faith sincerely preached to keep the holy Church of God in peace:"† and to do this was so proper to the emperors, that when Ruffin did affirm St. Hilary to have been excommunicated in a synod, St. Jerome, to confute him, did ask; "Tell me, what emperor did command this synod to be congregated?"‡ implying it to be illegal or impossible that a synod should be congregated without the imperial command.

Particularly Eusebius saith of the first Christian emperor, that "as a common bishop appointed by God he did summon synods of God's ministers;"§ so did he "command a great number of bishops to meet at Arles," (for decision of the Donatists' cause;) so did he also command the bishops from all quarters to meet at Tyre, for examination of the affairs concerning Athanasius; and that he did convocate the great synod

* Socr. 5. Prooem.

† Justin. in Syn. 5. Collat. i. (p. 209.) Græce p. 368. magis emphatice.

‡ Hier.

§ Euseb. de Vit. Const. I. 44. Euseb. Hist. x. 5. Ep. ad Chrestum, &c.

of Nice (the first and most renowned of all general synods) all the historians do agree, he did himself affirm, the Fathers thereof in their synodical remonstrances did avow; as we shall hereafter, in remarking on the passages of that synod, show.

The same course did his son Constantius follow, without impediment; for although he was a favorer of the Arian party, yet did the Catholic bishops readily at his call assemble in the great synods of Sardica,* of Ariminum,† of Seleucia,‡ of Sirmium,§ of Milan,|| &c. Which he out of a great zeal to compose dissensions among the bishops did convocate.

After him the Emperor Valentinian, understanding of dissensions about divine matters, to compose them, did indict a synod in Illyricum.¶

A while after, for settlement of the Christian state, (which had been greatly disturbed by the persecution of Julian and of Valens, and by divers factions,) Theodosius I. did "command," saith Theodoret, "the bishops of his empire to be assembled together at Constantinople;"** the which meeting accordingly did make the second general synod: in the congregation of which the Pope had so little to do, that Baronius saith it was celebrated against his will.

Afterwards, when Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, affecting to seem wiser than others in explaining the mystery of Christ's incarnation, had raised a jangle to the disturbance of the Church; for removing it, the Emperor Theodosius II. did "by his edict command the bishops to meet at Ephesus;"†† who there did celebrate the third general council: in the beginning of each action it is affirmed that the synod was "convocated by the imperial decree;" the synod itself doth often profess it; the Pope's own legate doth acknowlege it; and so doth Cyril the president thereof.‡‡

The same emperor, on occasion of Eutyches being condemned at Constantinople, and the stirs thence arising, did indict the second general synod of Ephesus, (which proved abortive by the miscarriages of Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria,) as appeareth by his imperial letters to Dioscorus and the other bishops, summoning them to that synod: "We have decreed

* Theod ii. 4. Soz. iii. 11. Socr. ii. 16. 20. Athan. tom. i. p. 761. Hil. in Fragm. Sulp. ii. 52.

† Syn. Arim. Ep. ad Const. Socr. ii. 37.

‡ Socr. ii. 39. Ann. 381.

§ Socr. ii. 29. Soz. iv. 6.

|| Socr. i. 36. Soz. iv. 9.

¶ Theod. iv. 7.

** Soz. vii. 7. Socr. v. 8. Theod. v. 7.

†† Socr. vii. 34. Evagr. i. 3.

‡‡ Syn. Eph. Act. i. p. 291. Act. v. p. 347. 404. Act. iii. p. 330.

that the most holy bishops meeting together," &c. "After the same manner the other most reverend bishops were written to, to come to the synod."* And as Pope Leo doth confess, calling it "the council of bishops, which you (Theodosius) commanded to be held at Ephesus."†

The next general synod of Chalcedon ‡ was convocated by the authority of the Emperor Marcian; as is expressed in the beginning of each action,§ as the emperor declareth, as the synod itself, in the front of its definition, doth avow; "The holy, great, and œcumenical synod, gathered together by the grace of God and the command of our most dread emperors, &c. has determined as follows." ||

The fifth general synod was also congregated by the authority of Justinian I.;¶ and the emperor's letter authorising it, beginneth (as we saw before) with an assertion, (backed with a particular enumeration,) that all former great synods were called by the same power: the Fathers themselves do say that they had "come together according to the will of God, and the command of the most pious emperor."** So little had the Pope to do in it, that, as Baronius himself telleth us, it was congregated "against his will, or with his resistance."††

The sixth general synod at Constantinople was also indicted by the emperor Constantine Pogonatus; as doth appear by his letters, as is intimated at the entrance of each action, as the synod doth acknowlege, as Pope Leo II. (in whose time it was concluded) doth affirm. The synod, in its definition, as also in its Epistle to Pope Agatho, doth inscribe itself, "The holy and œcumenical synod, congregated by the grace of God, and the altogether religious sanction of the most pious and most faithful great emperor Constantine:"‡‡ and in their definition they say, "By this doctrine of peace dictated by God, our most gracious emperor, through the divine wisdom being guided, as a defender of the true faith, and an enemy to the false, having gathered us together in this holy and œcumenical synod, has united the whole frame of the Church," &c.§§ In its acclamatory oration to the emperor it saith, *Ταῖς θειοτάταις ὑμῶν προστάξεσιν εἴκοντες ὅτε τῆς πρεσβυτάτης καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἀρχιερατικώτατος πρόεδρος καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐλάχιστοι*, &c. Act.

* Syn. Chalc. pars i. p. 53.
† P. Leo I. Ep. 25. (et 24.) ad Theod.
‡ Ann. 451.
§ Act. vi. p. 345.
|| Act. vi. 346.
¶ Ann. 533.
** Collat. 8.
†† Baron. ann. 553. §. 219.
‡‡ Act. xviii. p. 255. 285. (in Epist. ad P. Agath.)
§§ Act. xviii. p. 256. in Definitione Synodica.

xviii. p. 271. "We all acquiescing in your most sacred commands; both the most holy president of (Rome) the most ancient and apostolical city, and we the least," &c.*

These are all the great synods which posterity with clear consent did admit as general; for the next two have been disclaimed by great churches, (the seventh by most of the western churches, the eighth by the eastern,) so that even divers Popes after them did not reckon them for general councils;† and all the rest have been only assemblies of western bishops, celebrated after the breach between the oriental and occidental churches.

Yet even that second synod of Nice, which is called the seventh synod, doth avow itself to have "convened by the emperor's command;"‡ and in the front of each action, as also of their synodical definition, the same style is retained.

Hitherto it is evident that all general synods were convocated by the imperial authority; and about this matter divers things are observable.

It is observable in how peremptory a manner the emperors did require the bishops to convene at the time and place appointed by them. Constantine, in his letter indicting the synod of Tyre, hath these words; "If any one presuming to violate our command and sense," &c.§

Theodosius II. summoneth the bishops to the Ephesine synod in these terms; "We taking a great deal of care about these things, will not suffer any one, if he be absent, to go unpunished; nor shall he find excuse either with God or us, who presently without delay does not by the time set appear in the place appointed."‖

In like terms did he call them to the second Ephesine synod; "If any one shall choose to neglect meeting in a synod so necessary and grateful to God, and by the set time do not with all diligence appear in the place appointed, he shall find no excuse," &c.¶

Marcian thus indicteth the synod of Nice, (after by him translated to Chalcedon;) "It properly seemeth good to our

* P. Leo II. in Ep. ad Con. Imp. p. 305.

† P. Joh. VIII. Ep. 247. P. Nic. I. Ep. 7. 8. 10. P. Hadr. II. Ep. 26.

‡ Act. vii. p. 831. i. 519. ii. 551. iii. 586. iv. 609. v. 696. vi. 722. vii. 812. Defin. Synod. Act. vii. p. 817.

§ Euseb. de Vit. Const. iv. 42. (Vid. in v. p. 30.)

‖ Theod. Jun. Ep. ad Cyril. Conc. Eph. pars i. p. 2. 6.

¶ Theod. in Ep. ad Diosc. in Conc. Chalc. Act. i. p. 53.

clemency, that an holy synod meet in the city of Nice, in the province of Bithynia."*

Again we may observe that in the imperial edicts, or epistles whereby councils effectually were convened, there is nothing signified concerning the Pope's having any authority to call them; it is not as by licence from the Pope's holiness, but in their own name and authority they act: which were very strange, if the Popes had any plea then commonly approved for such a power.

As commonly emperors did call synods by the suggestion of other bishops,† so again there be divers instances of Popes applying themselves to the emperors with petitions to indict synods; wherein sometimes they prevailed, sometimes they were disappointed: so Pope Liberius did request of Constantius to indict a synod for deciding the cause of Athanasius. "Ecclesiastical judgment" (said he, as Theodoret reports) "should be made with great equity: wherefore, if it please your piety, command a judicatory to be constituted:"‡ and in his epistle to Hosius, produced by Baronius, he saith, "Many bishops out of Italy met together, who together with me had beseeched the most religious emperor, that he would command, as he had thought fit, the council of Aquileia to meet."§

So Pope Damasus, having a desire that a general synod should be celebrated in Italy for repressing heresies and factions then in the church, did obtain the imperial letters for that purpose directed to the eastern bishops, as they in their epistle to the western bishops do intimate: "But because expressing a brotherly affection toward us, ye have called us, as your own members, by the most pious emperor's letters, to that synod which by the will of God ye are gathering at Rome."‖

It is a wonder that Bellarmine should have the confidence to allege this passage for himself.¶

So again Pope Innocent I. being desirous to restore St. Chrysostom, "did," as Sozomen telleth us, "send five bishops and two priests of the Roman church to Honorius and to Arcadius the emperor, requesting a synod, with the time and the place thereof:"** in which attempt he suffered a repulse; for the courtiers of Arcadius did repel those agents, "as troubling another government, which was beyond their bounds,"†† or wherein the Pope had nothing to do, that they knew of.

* In Epist. ad Episc. Syn. Chalc. pars i. p. 34.
† Evagr. i. 3. ‡ Theod. ii. 16.
§ Baron. ann. 353. §. 19. ‖ Theod. v. 9.
¶ Bell. de Pont. R. II. 13. ** Soz. viii. 28. †† Ibid.

So also Pope Leo I.* (whom no Pope could well exceed in zeal to maintain the privileges and advance the eminence of his see) did in these terms request Theodosius to indict a synod; "Whence if your pity shall vouchsafe consent to our suggestion and supplication, that you would command an episcopal council to be held in Italy; soon, God aiding, may all scandals be cut off."† On this occasion the emperor did appoint a council (not in Italy, according to the Pope's desire, but) at Ephesus; the which not succeeding well, Pope Leo again did address to Theodosius in these words: "All the churches of our parts, all bishops with groans and tears, do supplicate your grace, that you would command a general synod to be celebrated within Italy."‡ To which request (although backed with the desire of the western emperor) Theodosius would by no means consent: for, as Leontius reporteth, "when Valentinian, being importuned by Pope Leo, did write to Theodosius II. that he would procure another synod to be held for examining whether Dioscorus had judged rightly or no, Theodosius did write back to him, saying, I shall make no other synod."§

The same Pope did again of the same emperor petition for a synod to examine the cause of Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople; "Let your clemency," saith he, "be pleased to grant an universal council to be held in Italy; as with me the synod, which for this cause did meet at Rome, doth request." Thus did that Pope continually harp on one string, to get a general synod to be celebrated at his own doors; but never could obtain his purpose, the emperor being stiff in refusing it.

The same Pope, with better success, (as to the thing, though not as to the place,‖) did request of the emperor Marcian a synod; for he (concurring in opinion that it was needful) "did," saith Liberatus, "at the petition of the Pope and the Roman princes, command a general council to be congregated at Nice."¶

Now if the Pope had himself a known right to convocate synods, what needed all this supplication, or this application to the emperors? Would not the Pope have endeavored to exercise his authority? would he not have clamored or whined at any interruption thereof? Would so spiritual and sturdy a Pope as Leo have begged that to be done by another which he had authority to do of himself, when he did apprehend so great

* Ep. 23. † P. Leo I. Ep. 9. ‡ P. Leo I. Ep. 42.
§ Leont. de Sect. Act. 4.
‖ Leo Ep. 50. P. Leo, Ep. 43. 44. 50. ¶ Lib. Brev. cap. 13.

necessity for it, and was so much provoked thereto? Would he not at least have remonstrated against the injury therein done to him by Theodosius?

All that this daring Pope could adventure at was to wind in a pretence that the synod of Chalcedon was congregated by his consent; for, "It hath been the pleasure (of whom? I pray) that a general council should be congregated, both by the command of the Christian princes, and with the consent of the apostolic see,"* saith he very cunningly; yet not so cunningly, but that any other bishop might have said the same for his see.

This power indeed on many just accounts peculiarly doth belong to princes; it suiteth to the dignity of their state, it appertaineth to their duty, they are most able to discharge it. They are the guardians of public tranquillity, which constantly is endangered, which commonly is violated, by dissensions in religious matters; (whence we must pray for them, that by their care 'we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty;') they alone can authorise their subjects to take such journeys, or to meet in such assemblies; they alone can well cause the expenses needful for holding synods to be exacted and defrayed; they alone can protect them, can maintain order and peace in them, can procure observance to their determinations; they alone have a sword to constrain resty and refractory persons (and in no cases are men so apt to be such as in debates about these matters) to convene, to confer peaceably, to agree, to observe what is settled; they, as 'nursing-fathers of the Church,' as 'ministers of God's kingdom,' as 'encouragers of all good works,' as the stewards of God, intrusted with the great talents of power, dignity, wealth, enabling them to serve God, are obliged to cause bishops in such cases to perform their duty; according to the example of good princes in holy Scripture, who are commended for proceedings of this nature: for so king Josias did convocate a general synod of the Church in his time; 'Then,' saith the text, 'the king sent, and gathered together all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem:' in this synod he presided, 'standing in his place, and making a covenant before the Lord;' its resolutions he confirmed, 'causing all that were present in Jerusalem and Benjamin to stand to that covenant;' and he took care of their execution, 'making all present in Israel effectually to serve the Lord their God.'

So also did king Hezekiah 'gather the priests and Levites

* Ep. 61.

together,' did warn, did command them to do their duty, and reform things in the Church; 'My sons,' said he, 'be not now negligent; for the Lord hath chosen you to stand before him, to serve him, and that ye should minister unto him, and burn incense.'

Beside them none other can have reasonable pretence to such a power, or can well be deemed able to manage it: so great an authority cannot be exercised on the subjects of any prince, without eclipsing his majesty, infringing his natural right, and endangering his state. He that at his pleasure can summon all Christian pastors, and make them trot about, and hold them when he will, is in effect emperor, or in a fair way to make himself so. It is not fit therefore that any other person should have all the governors of the Church at his beck, so as to draw them from remote places whither he pleaseth; to put them on long and chargeable journeys; to detain them from their charge; to set them on what deliberations and debates he thinketh good. It is not reasonable that any one, without the leave of princes, should authorise so great conventions of men, having such interest and sway; it is not safe that any one should have such dependences on him, by which he may be tempted to clash with princes, and withdraw his subjects from their due obedience. Neither can any success be well expected from the use of such authority by any who hath not power, by which he can force bishops to convene, to resolve, to obey; whence we see that Constantine, who was a prince so gentle and friendly to the clergy, was put to threaten those bishops who would absent themselves from the synod indicted by him at Tyre: and Theodosius* (also a very mild and religious prince) did the like, in his summoning the two Ephesine synods. We likewise may observe that when the "Pope and western bishops," in a synodical epistle, "did invite those of the east to a great synod indicted at Rome, these did refuse the journey, alleging that it would be to no good purpose:"† so also when the western bishops did call those of the east, for resolving the difference between Flavianus and Paulinus, both pretending to be bishops of Antioch, what effect had their summons? And so will they always or often be ready to say, who are called at the pleasure of those who want force to constrain them: so that such authority in unarmed hands (and God keep arms out of the Pope's hands) will be only a source of discords.

Either the Pope is a subject, as he was in the first times, and then it were too great a presumption for him to claim such

* Socr. vii. 42. † Theod. v. 8. Soz. vii. 11.

a power over his fellow-subjects in prejudice to his sovereign; (nor indeed did he presume so far, until he had in a manner shaken off subjection to the emperor;) or he is not a subject; and then it is not reasonable that he should have such power in the territories of another prince.

The whole business of general synods was an expedient for peace, contrived by emperors, and so to be regulated by their order. Hence even in times and places where the Pope was most reverenced, yet princes were jealous of suffering the Pope to exercise such a power over the bishops their subjects; and to obviate it, did command all bishops not to stir out of their territories without licence; particularly our own nation, in the Council at Clarendon, where it was decreed, "That they should not go out of the kingdom without the king's leave."*

To some things above said, a passage may be objected which occurreth in the acclamation of the sixth synod to the emperor Constantine Pogonatus; wherein it is said that Constantine and Sylvester did collect the synod of Nice; Theodosius I. and Damasus, (together with Gregory and Nectarius,) the synod of Constantinople; Theodosius II. with Celestine and Cyril, the Ephesine synod:† and so of the rest. To which I answer, that the Fathers mean only for the honor of those prelates to signify that they in their places and ways did concur and cooperate to the celebration of those synods; otherwise we might, as to matter of fact and history, contest the accurateness of their relation; and it is observable that they join other great bishops, then flourishing, with the Popes; so that if their suffrage prove any thing, it proveth more than our adversaries would have, namely, that all great bishops and patriarchs have a power or right to convocate synods.

As for passages alleged by our adversaries, that no synod could be called, or ecclesiastical law enacted, without consent of the Pope, they are nowise pertinent to this question; for we do not deny that the Pope had a right to sit in every general synod; and every other patriarch at least had no less; as all reason and practice do show;‡ and as they of the seventh synod do suppose, arguing the synod of Constantinople, which condemned the worship of images, to be no general council, "because it had not the Pope's cooperation, nor the consent of the eastern patriarchs."§ Syncellus, the patriarch of Jerusalem's legate in the eighth synod, says, "For this reason

* Conc. Clarend. Vid. Matt. Par. ann. 1164.

† Syn. Sext. Act. xviii. p. 272.

‡ Anteacta Syn. Nic. II. p. 518. § Syn. 7. Act. vi. p. 725.

did the Holy Spirit set up patriarchs in the world, that they might suppress scandals arising in the Church of God:"* and Photius is in the same synod told, "that the judgment passed against him was most equal and impartial, as proceeding not from one, but all the four patriarchs."†

That a general synod doth not need a Pope to call it, or preside in it, appeareth by what the Synods of Pisa and Constance define, for provision in time of schisms.‡

II. It inseparably doth belong to sovereigns in the general assemblies of their states to preside, and moderate affairs; proposing what they judge fit to be consulted or debated; stopping what seemeth unfit to be moved; keeping proceedings within order and rule, and steering them to a good issue; checking disorders and irregularities, which the distemper or indiscretion of any persons may create in deliberations or disputes.

This privilege therefore the Pope doth claim; not allowing any general council to be legitimate, wherein he in person, or by his legates, doth not preside and sway. "All Catholics," says Bellarmine, "teach this to be the chief Pontiff's proper office, that either in person or by his legate he preside, and as chief judge moderate all."§

But for this prerogative no express grant from God, no ancient canon of the Church, no certain custom can be produced.

Nor doth ancient practice favor the Pope's claim to such a prerogative, it appearing that he did not exercise in the first general synods.

St. Peter himself did not preside in the apostolical synod at Jerusalem, where he was present; but rather St. James, as we before have showed.

In all the first synods, convocated by emperors, they did either themselves in person, or by honorable persons authorised by them, in effect preside, governing the proceedings.

In the synod of Nice, Constantine was the chief manager, director, and moderator of the transactions; and under him other chief bishops did preside; but that the Pope's legates had any considerable influence or sway there, doth by no evidence appear, as we shall hereafter out of history declare.‖

In the synod of Sardica, (which in design was a general council, but in effect did not prove so, being divided by a schism into two great parts,) Hosius, bishop of Corduba, did preside, or (by reason of his age and venerable worth) had the first place assigned to him, and bore the office of prolocutor;

* Syn. 8. Act. i. p. 930. † Act. v. p. 945.
‡ Sess. 39. p. 1109. § Bell. de Conc. i. 19. ‖ Euseb. iii. 13.

so the synod itself doth imply; "All we bishops (say they in their Catholic epistle) meeting together, and especially the most ancient Hosius, who for his age, and for his confession, and for that he hath undergone so much pains, is worthy all reverence:"* so Athanasius expressly doth call him; "The holy synod," saith he, "the prolocutor of which was the great Hosius, presently sent to them,"† &c. The canons of the synod intimate the same, wherein he proposeth matters, and asketh the pleasure of the synod: the same is confirmed by the subscriptions of their general epistle, wherein he is set before Pope Julius himself; ("Hosius from Spain, Julius of Rome, by the presbyters Archidamus and Philoxenus."‡) In this all ecclesiastical histories do agree; none speaking of the Pope's presiding there by his legates.

In the second general synod at Constantinople the Pope had plainly no stroke; the oriental bishops alone did there resolve on matters, being headed by their patriarchs, (of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem,) as Sozomen saith; "being guided by Nectarius and St. Gregory Nazianzen,"§ as the Council of Chalcedon in its epistle to the emperor doth aver.

In the third general synod at Ephesus, Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, did preside, as Pope Leo himself doth testify: he is called "the head of it,"‖ in the Acts.

We may note that the bishop of the place where the synod is held did bear a kind of presidency in all synods; so did St. James, bishop of Jerusalem, in the first synod, as St. Chrysostom noteth; so did Protogenes at Sardica, and Nectarius at Constantinople, and Memnon in this of Ephesus.

It is true that according to the acts of that synod, and the reports of divers historians, Pope Celestine (according to a new politic device of Popes) did authorise Cyril to represent his person, and act as his proctor in those affairs; assigning to him, as he saith, jointly, both the authority of his throne, (that is, his right of voting) and the order of his place, (the first place in sitting;) but it is not consequent thence, that Cyril on that sole account did preside in the synod.¶ He thereby had the dis-

* Athan. Apol. ii. p. 761.

† Athan. ad Solit. p. 819. Soz. xii. 13. ‡ Apud Athan. p. 767.

§ Baron. ann. 553. §. 224. Ἡγοῦντο. Soz. vii. 7. Conc. Chalc. in Epist. ad Imp. Marc. (p. 469.) ‖ P. Leo I. Ep. 47.

¶ Celest. ad Cyril. Relat. cap 16.

N. Yet the Fathers in their epistle to Pope Celestine do only take notice of Arcadius, Projectus, and Philippus supplying his place. Act. p. 353.

posal of one so considerable suffrage, or a legal concurrence of the Pope with him in his actings; he thereby might pretend to the first place of sitting and subscribing, (which kind of advantages it appeareth that some bishops had in synods by the virtue of the like substitution in the place of others,) but he thence could have no authoritative presidency; for that the Pope himself could by no delegation impart, having himself no title thereto warranted by any law or by any precedent; that depended on the emperor's will, or on the election of the Fathers, or on a tacit regard to personal eminence in comparison to others present: this distinction Evagrius seemeth to intimate, when he saith that the divine Cyril did "administer it, and the place of Celestine,"* (where a word seemeth to have fallen out:) and Zonoras more plainly doth express, saying, that "Cyril, Pope of Alexandria, did preside over the orthodox fathers, and also did hold the place of Celestine:"† and Photius; "Cyril did supply the seat and the person of Celestine." If any latter historians do confound these things, we are not obliged to comply with their ignorance or mistake.

Indeed as to presidency there we may observe that sometime it is attributed to Cyril alone, as being the first bishop present, and bearing a great sway; sometimes to Pope Celestine, as being in representation present, and being the first bishop of the Church in order; sometimes to both Cyril and Celestine; sometimes to Cyril, and Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, who, as being very active, and having great influence on the proceedings, are styled the presidents and rulers of the synod.‡ The which showeth that presidency was a lax thing, and no peculiarity in right or usage annexed to the Pope; nor did altogether depend on his grant or representation, to which Memnon had no title.

The Pope himself and his legates are divers times in the Acts said συνεδρεύειν, to sit together with the bishops; which confidence doth not well comport with his special right to presidency.§

Yea, it is observable that the oriental bishops, which with John of Antioch did oppose the Cyrillian party in that synod, did charge on Cyril, that "he (as if he lived in a time of

* Evagr. i. 4. † Zon. in Syn. Eph. can. 1.

‡ Con. Chalc. Act. iv. p. 302. Cler. Const. in Syn. Eph. p. 418. Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p. 173. Syn. Chalc. Defin. in Act. v. p. 338. iv. p. 300. The bishops of Isauria to the Emperor Leo, say that Cyril was partaker with Pope Celestine, &c. Eph. Act. iv. p. 338. (p. 420. 422.) Act. v. p. 347.

§ Relat. ad Imp. p. 422. Act. ii. p. 322. Act. iv. p. 340.

anarchy) did proceed to all irregularity;" and that "snatching to himself the authority, which neither was given him by the canons, nor by the emperor's sanctions, did rush on to all kind of disorder and unlawfulness:"* whence it is evident that in the judgment of those bishops, (among whom were divers worthy and excellent persons,†) the Pope had no right to any authoritative presidency.

This word presidency indeed hath an ambiguity, apt to impose on those who do not observe it; for it may be taken for a privilege of precedence, or for authority to govern things: the first kind of presidence the Pope without dispute, when present at a synod, would have had among the bishops (as being the "bishop of the first see,"‡ as the sixth synod calleth him; and "the first of priests,"§ as Justinian calleth him;) and in his absence his legates might take up his chair, (for in general synods each see had its chair assigned to it, according to its order of dignity by custom.) And according to this sense the patriarchs and chief metropolitans are also often (singly or conjunctly) said to preside, as sitting in one of the first chairs.

But the other kind of presidency was (as those bishops in their complaint against Cyril do imply, and as we shall see in practice) disposed by the emperor, as he saw reason; although usually it was conferred on him, who, among those present, in dignity did precede the rest: this is that authority, αὐθεντία, which the Syrian bishops complained against Cyril for assuming to himself, without the emperor's warrant, and whereof we have a notable instance in the next general synod at Ephesus. For,

In the second Ephesine synod, (which in design was a general synod, lawfully convened, for a public cause of determining truth and settling peace in the Church; but which by some miscarriages proved abortive,) although the Pope had his legates there, yet by the emperor's order Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, did preside; "We," said Theodosius in his epistle to him, "do also commit to thy godliness the authority and the preeminency of all things appertaining to the synod now assembled:"‖ and in the synod of Chalcedon it is said of him that "he had received the authority of all affairs, and of judgment:"¶

* Relat. ad Imper. Act. Eph. p. 380.

† The Bishops of Syria being then the most learned in the world; as John of Antioch doth imply, p. 377.

‡ Syn. vi. p. 285. § Justin. Cod. tit. 1.

‖ Evag. i. 10. Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p. 59.

¶ Ibid. p. 160. Evag. i. 10.

and Pope Leo I. in his epistle to the emperor saith that Dioscorus did "challenge to himself the principal place;"* (insinuating a complaint that Dioscorus should be preferred before him, although not openly contesting his right.)

The emperor had indeed some reason not to commit the presidency to Pope Leo, because he was looked on as prejudiced in the cause, having declared in favor of Flavianus, against Eutyches; whence Eutyches declined his legate's interessing in the judgment of his cause, saying, "They were suspected to him, because they were entertained by Flavianus with great regard."† And Dioscorus, being bishop of the next see, was taken for more indifferent, and otherwise a person (however afterward it proved) of much integrity and moderation; "He did," saith the emperor, "shine by the grace of God, both in honesty of life, and orthodoxy of faith:"‡ and Theodoret himself, before those differences arose, doth say of him, that he was by common fame "reported a man adorned with many other kinds of virtue, and that especially he was celebrated for his moderation of mind."§

It is true that the legates of Pope Leo did take in dudgeon this preferment of Dioscorus; and (if we may give credence to Liberatus) "would not sit down in the synod, because the presession was not given to their holy see;"‖ and afterwards, in the synod of Chalcedon, the Pope's legate, Paschasinus,¶ (together with other bishops,) did complain that Dioscorus was preferred before the bishop of Constantinople: but notwithstanding those ineffectual mutinies, the emperor's will did take place, and according thereto Dioscorus had (although he did not use it so wisely and justly as he should) the chief managery of things.

It is to be observed that to other chief bishops the presidency in that synod is also ascribed, by virtue of the emperor's appointment; "Let the most reverend bishops" (say the imperial commissaries in the synod of Chalcedon) "to whom the authoritative management of affairs was by the royal sovereignty granted, speak why the epistle of the most holy archbishop Leo was not read:"** and, "You," say they again, "to whom the power of judging was given:"†† and of Dioscorus, Juvenalis (bishop of Jerusalem), Thalassius (of Cæsarea), Eusebius (of Ancyra), Eustathius (of Beristus), Basilius (of Seleusia), it is

* Leo I. Ep. 25. 26. &c. † Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p. 80.
‡ Theod. Ep. ad Diosc. in Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p. 59.
§ Theod. Ep. 60. ‖ Liber. cap. 12.
¶ Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p. 62. ** Ibid. p. 65.
†† Ibid. p. 77.

by the same commissioners said that they "had received the authority, and did govern the synod which was then;"* and Elpidius, the emperor's agent in the Ephesine synod itself, did expressly style them presidents; and Pope Leo himself calleth them "presidents and primates of the synod."†

Whence it appeareth that at that time, according to the common opinion and practice, authoritative presidency was not affixed to the Roman chair.

In the synod of Chalcedon, Pope Leo did indeed assume to himself a kind of presidency by his legates;‡ and no wonder that a man of a stout and ardent spirit (impregnated with high conceits of his see, and resolved with all his might to advance its interests, as his legates themselves did in effect declare to the world) should do so; having so favorable a time, by the misbehavior of Dioscorus and his adherents; against whom the clergy of Constantinople, and other Fathers of the synod, being incensed, were ready to comply with Leo, (who had been the champion and patron of their cause,) in allowing him extraordinary respect, and whatever advantages he could pretend to.

Yet in effect the emperor by his commissioners did preside there; they propounding and allowing matters to be discussed; moderating debates by their interlocution, and driving them to an issue; maintaining order and quiet in proceedings; performing those things which the Pope's legates at Trent or otherwhere, in the height of his power, did undertake.

To them supplicatory addresses were made for succor and redress by persons needing it; as for instance, "Command," said Eusebius of Dorylæum, "that my supplications may be read."§

Of them leave is requested for time to deliberate; "Command," (saith Atticus, in behalf of other bishops,) "that respite be given, so that within a few days, with a calm mind and undisturbed reason, those things may be formed which shall be pleasing to God and the holy Fathers."‖

Accordingly they order the time for consultation; "Let," said they, "the hearing be deferred for five days, that in the mean time your holiness may meet at the house of the most holy archbishop Anatolius, and deliberate in common about the faith, that the doubtful may be instructed."¶

They were acknowleged judges, and had thanks given them

* Act. ii. p. 202. iv. 288. (Evagr. 24. ἔξαρχοι.) Ibid. p. 70.
† Leo. Ep. 51. ‡ P. Leo I. Ep. 47.
§ Act. i. p. 50. ‖ Act. i. p. 219. ¶ Act. iv. p. 289.

for the issue by persons concerned; "I," said Eunomius, bishop of Nicomedia, "do thank your honor for your right judgment."* And in the cause between Stephanus and Bassianus concerning their title to the bishopric of Ephesus, they having declared their sense, "the holy synod cried, This is right judgment; Christ hath decided the case, God judgeth by you:"† and in the result, on their declaring their opinion, "the whole synod exclaimed, This is a right judgment, this is a pious order."‡

When the bishops, transported with eagerness and passion, did tumultuously clamor, they gravely did check them, saying, "These vulgar exclamations neither become bishops, nor shall advantage the parties."§

In the great contest about the privileges of the Constantinopolitan see, they did arbitrate and decide the matter, even against the sense and endeavors of the Pope's legates;‖ the whole synod concurring with them in these acclamations, "This is a right sentence; we all say these things; these things please us all; things are duly ordered: let the things ordered be held."¶

The Pope's legates themselves did avow this authority in them; for, "If," said Paschasinus, in the case of the Egyptian bishops, "your authority doth command, and ye enjoin that somewhat of humanity be granted to them, &c."**

And in another case, "If," said the bishops, "supplying the place of the apostolical see, your honors do command, we have an information to suggest."††

Neither is the presidency of these Roman legates expressed in the conciliar acts; but they are barely said συνελθεῖν,‡‡ (to concur,) and συνεδρεύειν,§§ (to sit together,) with the other Fathers: and accordingly, although they sometimes talked high, yet it is not observable that they did much there; their presidency was nothing like that at Trent, and in other like papal synods. It may be noted that the emperor's deputies are always named in the first place, at the entrance of the Acts, before the Pope's legates, so that they who directed the notaries were not popish. In effect the emperor was president, though not as a judge of spiritual matters, yet as an orderer of the conciliar transactions; as the synod doth report it to Leo; "The

* Act. xiii. p. 420. † Act. xii. p. 409. ‡ Ibid. p. 414.
§ Act. i. p. 55. ‖ Syn. Chalc. ad Leon. Ep. p. 475.
¶ Act. xvi. p. 464. ** Act. iv. p. 315. †† Act. xvi. p. 451.
‡‡ Act v. vii. viii. p. 366. Act. ix. xi. xiii. xiv.
§§ Act. iii. (p. 230.)

faithful emperors," said they, "did preside (or govern it) for good order sake."*

In the fifth general synod, Pope Vigilius indeed was moved to be present, and (in his way) to preside; but he out of state or policy declined it;† wherefore the patriarch of Constantinople was the ecclesiastical president, as in the beginning of every collation doth appear: whence clearly we may infer that the Pope's presidency is nowise necessary to the being of a general council.

In the sixth general synod the emperor in each act is expressly said to preside, in person or by his deputies; although Pope Agatho had his legates there.

In the synod of Constance sometimes the cardinal of Cambray, sometimes of Hostia, did preside, (by order of the synod itself,) and sometimes the king of the Romans did supply that place:‡ so little essential was the Pope's presidency to a council deemed even then, when papal authority had mounted to so high a pitch.

Nor is there good reason why the Pope should have this privilege, or why this prerogative should be affixed to any one see; so that (if there be cause; as if the Pope be unfit, or less fit; if princes or the Church cannot confide in him; if he be suspected of prejudice or partiality; if he be party in causes or controversies to be decided; if he do himself need correction) princes may not assign, or the Church with allowance of princes may not choose any other president, more proper in their judgment for that charge: in such cases the public welfare of Church and State is to be regarded.

Were an erroneous Pope (as Vigilius or Honorius) fit to govern a council, gathered to consult about defining truth in the matter of their error?

Were a lewd Pope (as Alexander VI. John XII. Paul III. innumerable such, scandalously vicious) worthy to preside in a synod convocated to prescribe strict laws of reformation?

Were a furious, pugnacious Pope, (as Julius II.) apt to moderate an assembly drawn together for settlement of peace?

Were a Pope engaged in schism (as many have been) a proper moderator of a council designed to suppress schism?

Were a Gregory VII. or an Innocent IV. or a Boniface VIII. an allowable manager anywhere of controversies about the papal authority.

* Relat. Syn. ad Leon. 473.
† Coll. i. p. 212. (et in Const. Vigil.)
‡ Syn. Const. Sess. xiv. (p. 1044.)

Were now indeed any Pope fit to preside in any council wherein the reformation of the Church is concerned, it being notorious that Popes, as such, do most need reformation, that they are the great obstructors of it, that all Christendom hath a long time a controversy with them for their detaining it in bondage?

In this and many other cases we may reject their presidency, as implying iniquity, according to the rule of an old Pope; "I would know of them, where they would have that judgment they pretend, examined? What! by themselves? that the same may be adversaries, witnesses, and judges? To such judgment as this even human affairs are not to be trusted, much less the integrity of the divine law."*

It is not reasonable that any person should have such a prerogative, which would be an engine of mischief: for thereby (bearing sway in general assemblies of bishops) he would be enabled and irresistibly tempted to domineer over the world; to abuse princes, and disturb states; to oppress and enslave the Church; to obstruct all reformation; to enact laws; to promote and establish errors serviceable to his interests: the which effects of such power exercised by him in the Synod of Trent, and in divers other of the later general synods, experience hath declared.

III. If the Pope were sovereign of the Church, the legislative power, wholly or in part, would belong to him; so far, at least, that no synod, or ecclesiastical consistory, could without his consent determine or prescribe any thing; his approbation would be required to give life and validity to their decrees; he should at least have a negative, so that nothing might pass against his will: this is a most essential ingredient of sovereignty; and is therefore claimed by the Pope, who long hath pretended that no decrees of synods are valid without his consent and confirmation.

"But the decrees made by the holy Popes of the chief see of the Roman church, by whose authority and sanction all synods and holy councils are strengthened and established, why do you say that you do not receive and observe them?"†

"Lastly, as you know nothing is accounted valid, or to be received in universal councils, but what the see of St. Peter has approved; so, on the other side, whatever she alone has rejected, that only is rejected."‡

* P. Gel. Ep. 4. † Papa Nic. I. Ep. 6. (ad Photium.)
‡ P. Nich. I. Ep. 7.

"We never read of any synod that was valid, unless it were confirmed by the apostolic authority."*

"We trust no true Christian is now ignorant that no see is above all the rest more obliged to observe the constitution of each council, which the consent of the universal Church hath approved, than the prime see, which by its authority confirms every synod, and by continued moderating preserves them according to its principality," &c.†

But this pretence, as it hath no ground in the divine law, or in any old canon, or in primitive custom; so it doth cross the sentiments and practice of antiquity: for that in ancient synods divers things were ordained without the Pope's consent, divers things against his pleasure.

What particular or formal confirmation did St. Peter yield to the assembly at Jerusalem?

That in some of the first general synods he was not apprehended to have any negative voice, is by the very tenor and air of things, or by the little regard expressed toward him, sufficiently clear. There is not in the synodical epistles of Nice, or of Sardica, any mention of his confirmation.

Interpretatively all those decrees may be supposed to pass without his consent, which do thwart these pretences; for if these are now good, then of old they were known and admitted for such; and being such, we cannot suppose the Pope willingly to have consented in derogation to them.

Wherefore the Nicene canons establishing ecclesiastical administrations without regard to him, and in authority equalling other metropolitans with him, may be supposed to pass without his consent.

The canons of the second general council, and of all others confirming those; as also the canons of all synods which advanced the see of Constantinople,‡ his rival for authority, above its former state, first to a proximity in order, then to an equality of privileges with the see of Rome, may, as plainly contrary to his interest and spirit, be supposed to pass without his consent: and so divers Popes have affirmed. If we may believe Pope Leo, (as I suppose,) the canons of the second council were not transmitted to Rome: they did therefore pass, and obtain in practice of the Catholic Church, without

* P. Pelag. II. Ep. 8. (Dist. 17.)

† P. Gelas. I. Ep. 13. (ad Episc. Dard.) Vid. p. 647. Tract. de Anath.

‡ Leo. Ep. 53. (ad Anat.) Conc. Constant. can. 3. Concil. Chalc. can. 9. 17. 28. Syn. Trull. can. 36.

its consent or knowlege. Pope Gregory I. saith, "that the Roman church did not admit them;"* wherein it plainly discorded with the Catholic Church, which with all reverence did receive and hold them: and in despite to the canon of that synod, advancing the royal city to that eminency, Pope Gelasius I. would not admit it for so much as a metropolitan see.† O proud insolency! O contentious forwardness! O rebellious contumacy against the Catholic Church and its peace! (Such was the humor of that see, to allow nothing which did not suit with the interests of its ambition.)

But farther, divers synodical decrees did pass expressly against the Pope's mind and will: I pass over those at Tyre, at Antioch, at Arminum, at Constantinople, in divers places of the east, (the which do yet evince that commonly there was no such opinion entertained of this privilege belonging to the Pope,) and shall instance only in general synods.

In the synod of Chalcedon equal privileges were assigned to the bishop of Constantinople, as the bishop of Rome had; this with a general concurrence "was decreed and subscribed," although the "Pope's legates did earnestly resist, clamor, and protest against it;"‡ the imperial commissioners and all the bishops not understanding or not allowing the Pope's negative voice.

And whereas Pope Leo (moved with a jealousy, that he who thus had obtained an equal rank with him should aspire to get above him) did fiercely dispute, exclaim, inveigh, menace against this order,§ striving to defeat it, pretending to annul it, laboring to depress the bishop of Constantinople from that degree, which both himself and his legates in the synod had acknowleged due to him: in which endeavor divers of his successors did imitate him; "Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum, said, I have willingly subscribed, because I have read this canon to the most holy Pope of Rome, the clergy of Constantinople being present, and he received it."‖

Yet could not he or they accomplish their design; the veneration of that synod and consent of Christendom overbearing their opposition; the bishop of Constantinople sitting in all the succeeding general synods in the second place, without any contrast; so that at length popes were fain to acquiesce in the bishop of Constantinople's possession of the second place in dignity among the patriarchs.

* P. Greg. M. Ep. vi. 31.
† P. Gelas. I. Ep. 13. (ad Episc. Dard.) ‡ Leo. I. Ep. 53. 54.
§ Ep. 53. 54. 55. 61. 62.
‖ Syn. Chalc. Act. xvi. (p. 462.) supra.

In the fifth general synod Pope Vigilius did make a Constitution, in most express terms prohibiting the condemnation of the three chapters, (as they are called,) and the anathematisation of persons deceased in peace of the Church; "We dare not ourselves," says he, "condemn Theodorus, neither do we yield to have him condemned by any other:"* and in the same Constitution he orders and decrees, "That nothing be said or done by any to the injury or discredit of Theodoret, bishop of Cyprus, a man most approved in the synod of Chalcedon:† "and the same," says he, "have the decrees of the apostolical see determined, that no man pass a new judgment on persons dead, but leave them as death found them." "Lastly, by that Constitution he specially provides that (as he had before said) nothing might be derogated from persons dying in the peace and communion of the universal Church, by his condemning that perverse opinion."‡

Yet did the synod (in smart terms reflecting on the Pope, and giving him the lie, not regarding his opinion or authority) decree that persons deceased were liable to be anathematised; they did anathematise Theodorus,§ they did expressly condemn each of the chapters; they threatened deposition or excommunication on whoever should oppose their Constitutions; they anathematise whoever doth not anathematise Theodorus.‖

But Pope Vigilius did refuse to approve their doctrine and sentence; and therefore (which was the case of many other bishops, as Baronius himself doth confess and argue) was driven into banishment; wherein he did expire.¶

Yet posterity hath embraced this synod as a legitimate and valid general synod; and the Popes following did profess the highest reverence thereto, equally with the preceding general synods:** so little necessary is the Pope's consent or concurrence to the validity of synodical definitions.

On this Baronius hath an admirable reflection: "Here stay," saith he, "O reader, and consider the matter attently, (ay, do so, I pray,) that it is no new thing, that some synod, in which the Pope was not even present by his legates, but did oppose it, should yet obtain the title of an Œcumenical Synod; whenas afterward the Pope's will did come in, that it should obtain such a title."††

So in the opinion of this doctor, the Pope can easily change

* Vig. Const. p. 186. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.
§ Coll. viii. p. 289. v. p. 250. viii. p. 293. ‖ Ibid.
¶ Baron. ann. 553. §. 219.
** Greg. Ep. i. 24. Pelag. II. Ep.—— Agatho. Syn. vi. Act. 4.
†† Baron. ann. 553. §. 224.

the nature of things, and make that become a general synod which once was none; yea which, as it was held, did not deserve the name of any synod at all.* O the virtue of papal magic! or rather, O the impudence of papal advocates!

The canons of the sixth general council,† exhibited by the Trullane (or Quinisext) Synod, clearly and expressly do condemn several doctrines and practices of Rome: I ask whether the Pope did confirm them? They will, to be sure, as they are concerned to do, answer, No: and indeed Pope Sergius, as Anastasius in his Life reporteth,‡ did refuse them; yet did they pass for legitimate in the whole Church; for in their general synod, (the second Nicene,) without contradiction, one of them is alleged (out of the very original paper, wherein the Fathers had subscribed) as a canon of the holy general sixth synod;§ and avowed for such by the patriarch Tarasius, both in way of argument of defence and of profession in his synodical epistle to the patriarchs; (where he saith "that together with the divine doctrines of the sixth synod, he doth also embrace the canons enacted by it;"‖) of which epistle Pope Adrian, in his answer thereto, doth recite a part containing those words, and applaud it for orthodox;¶ signifying no offence at his embracing the Trullane canons. And all those hundred and two canons are again avowed by the synod in their antithesis to the synod of Constantinople. In fine, if we believe Anastasius, Pope John VII. did, "being timorous, out of human frailty, direct these canons, without amendment, by two metropolites, to the Emperor;"** that is, he did admit them so as they stand.

But it may be instanced that divers synods have asked the Pope's consent for ratification of their decrees and acts.

So the Fathers of the second general synod, having in an epistle to Pope Damasus and the western bishops declared what constitutions they had made, in the close speak thus: "In which things, being legally and canonically settled by us, we do exhort your reverence to acquiesce, out of spiritual charity and fear of the Lord."††

So the synod of Chalcedon did, with much respect, ask from Pope Leo the confirmation of its sanctions. "That you may know how that we have done nothing for favor or out of spite,

* Baron. ann. 553. §. 219. † Can. 2. 7. 13. 36. 55. 58. 67.
‡ Anast. in Vit. Joh. VII.
§ Syn. Nic. II. Act. iv. (631.) ‖ Act. iii. p. 592.
¶ Ibid. (p. 363.) Act. vi. p. 732. (Dist. xvi. cap. 5. &c.)
** Anast. in Vit. Joh. VII. †† Theod. v. 9.

but as guided by the divine direction, we have made known to you the force of all that has been done, for your concurrence, and for the confirmation and approbation of the things done."*

Of the fifth synod Pope Leo II. saith, "that he agreed to what was determined in it, and confirms it with the authority of the blessed St. Peter."†

To these allegations we reply, that it was indeed the manner of all synods, (for notification of things, and promulgation of their orders; for demonstration and maintenance of concord; for adding weight and authority to their determinations; for engaging all bishops to a willing compliance in observing them, for attestation to the common interest of all bishops in the Christian truth, and in the governance and edification of the Church,) having framed decrees concerning the public state, to demand in fairest terms the consent to them of all Catholic bishops, who were absent from them, to be attested by their subscription.

So did Constantine recommend the Nicene decrees to all bishops, undertaking that they would assent to them."‡

So (more expressly) the synod of Sardica, in their epistle to all bishops of the Catholic Church; "Do ye also, our brethren and fellow-ministers, the more use diligence, as being present in spirit with our synod, to yield consent by your subscription, that concord may be preserved everywhere by all the fellow-ministers."§

So did Pope Liberius request of the emperor Constantius, "that the faith delivered at Nice might be confirmed by the subscription of all bishops."‖

So did Athanasius "procure a synod at Alexandria to confirm the decrees at Sardica and in Palestine concerning him."¶

So the Macedonian bishops are said to have authorised their agents "to ratify the faith of consubstantiality."**

Many such instances occur in story, by which it may appear that the decrees of synods concerning faith, or concerning any matters of common interest, were presented to all bishops, and their consent requested or required; because, say the Roman clergy in St. Cyprian, "a decree cannot be firm, which has not the consent of many."††

Whence it is no wonder, if any synods did thus proceed

* Syn. Chalc. ad P. Leon. I. p. 476.
† P. Leo II. Ep. (p. 306.)
‡ De Vit. Const. iii. 20. Ib. iii. 19.
§ Syn. Sard. Epist. apud Athan. in Apol. ii. p. 766.
‖ Soz. iv. 11. ¶ Id. iv. 1. ** Socr. iv. 12.
†† Cler. Rom. apud Cyp. Ep. 31.

toward so eminent a bishop as was he of Rome, that they should endeavor to give him satisfaction; that they should desire to receive satisfaction from him of his conspiring with them in faith, of his willingness to comply in observing good rules of discipline; that (as every vote had force, so) the suffrage of one in so great dignity and reputation might adjoin some regard to their judgment.*

The Pope's confirmation of synods, what was it in effect but a declaration of his approbation and assent, the which did confirm by addition of suffrage; as those who were present by their vote, and those who were absent by their subscription, are said to confirm the decrees of councils; every such consent being supposed to increase the authority; whence the number of bishops is sometimes reckoned according to the subscriptions of bishops absent; as the council of Sardica is sometimes related to consist of three hundred bishops, although not two hundred were present, the rest concurring by subscription to its definitions.

Other bishops, in yielding their suffrage, do express it by I confirm, I define, I decree.†

But the effectual confirmation of synods, which gave them the force of laws, was in other hands, and depended on the imperial sanction.

So Justinian affirmeth generally: "All these things, at divers times following, our above named predecessors, of pious memory, corroborated and confirmed by their laws what each council had determined, and expelled those heretics who attempted to resist the definitions of the aforesaid four councils, and disturb the churches."‡

So particularly Constantine (as Athanasius himself reporteth) "did by law confirm the decrees of the great synod of Nice:"§ and Eusebius assureth the same; "He," saith he, "did ratify the decrees of the synod by his authority."‖ His letters are extant, which he sent about the world, exhorting and requiring all to conform to the constitutions of that synod.

So Theodosius did confirm the decrees of the second general synod, "adding," saith Sozomon, "his confirmatory suffrage to their decree:"¶ the which he did at the supplication of the Fathers, addressed to him in these terms; "We therefore do

* Syn. Chalc. ad Leon. p. 476. † Conc. Rom. P. Hil. p. 579.
‡ Justin. in Conc. V. Coll. i. (p. 210.)
§ Athan. apud Theod. ii. 4. ‖ Euseb. de Vit. Const. iii. 23.
¶ Soz. vii. 9.

beseech your grace, that by your pious edict the sentence of the synod may be authorised; that as by the letters of convocation you did honor the assembly, so you would also confirm the result of things decreed."*

The third general synod was also confirmed by Theodosius II. as Justinian telleth us; "The above-named Theodosius, of pious memory, maintaining what had been so justly determined against Nestorius and his impiety, made his condemnation valid."†

And this emperor asserted this privilege to himself, as of right and custom belonging to him; writing to the synod in these words; "For all things, so as may please God, without contentiousness and with truth being examined, ought so to be established by our religiousness."‡

The other abortive synod at Ephesus was also confirmed by Theodosius junior, as Dioscorus in his defence alleged in these words, which show the manner of practice in this case; "We then indeed did judge the things which were judged; the whole synod did accord with us, and gave verdict by their own votes, and subscribed; and they were referred to the most religious emperor Theodosius, of happy memory; and he did by a general law confirm all things judged by the holy and œcumenical synod."§

So also did the emperor Marcian confirm the synod of Chalcedon, as himself telleth us in his royal edict; "We," saith he, "having by the sacred edict of our serenity confirmed the holy synod, did warn all to cease from disputes about religion:"‖ with which Pope Leo signifieth his compliance in these terms; "But because by all means your piety and most religious will must be obeyed, I have willingly approved the synodical constitutions about confirming the Catholic faith and condemning heretics, which pleased me."¶

Justinian did with a witness confirm the fifth synod, punishing with banishment all who would not submit to its determinations.

In the sixth synod the Fathers did request the emperor, according to custom, to confirm its definitions, in these very words; "To what we have determined set your seal, your

* Præf. ad Can. Conc. Const. (apud Bin. p. 660.)
† Justin. in Quinto Conc. Coll. 1.
‡ Epist. Theod. ad Syn. Eph. in Actis Conc. p. 375.
§ Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p. 59. ‖ Conc. Chalc. Part. iii. p. 478.
¶ P. Leo I. Ep. 59. (ad Mart. Aug.)

royal ratification by writing, and confirmation of them all by your sacred edicts and holy constitutions, according to custom."*

"We beg that by your sacred signing of it you would give force to what we have defined and subscribed."†

"We intreat the power of our lord, guided by God's wisdom, to confirm, for the greater strength and security of the orthodox faith, the copies of our determination read in the hearing of your most serene majesty, and subscribed by us, that they may be delivered to the five patriarchal sees with your pious confirmation."‡

Accordingly he did confirm that synod by his edict; "All these things being thus ordered by this sixth holy and œcumenical synod; we decree that none whosoever trouble himself farther about this faith, or advance any new inventions about it." §

So he told Pope Leo II. in his epistle to him; "This divine and venerable determination the holy synod has made, to which we also have subscribed, and confirmed it by our religious edicts, exhorting all our people, who have any love for Christ, to follow the faith there written."||

Pope Leo tells his namesake Leo the emperor, "that he must always remember that the imperial power was given him, not only to rule the world, but more especially to protect the Church."¶

So by long prescription, commencing with the first general synod, did the emperor enjoy this prerogative; and with good reason, he having an unquestionable warrant and obligation to promote the welfare of the Church, designed by those conventions; he being the guardian of concord among his subjects, and protector of their liberties, which might be nearly concerned in conciliar proceedings; the power of enacting laws being an incommunicable branch of sovereign majesty; he alone having power committed to him, able to enforce the observance of decrees, without which they would in effect signify little.

Because also commonly the decrees of synods did in a manner retrench some part of the royal prerogative, translating or imparting to others causes before appropriate to his jurisdiction, (as in the case of appeals, and of prohibiting addresses to court, ordered in the Sardican and other synods; of exempting cler-

* Syn. VI. Act. xviii. p. 275. † Ibid. p. 283.
‡ Ibid. p. 284. § Ibid. Edict. Const. p. 294.
|| Ibid. p. 298. 302. ¶ Leo. M. Ep. 75.

gymen from secular jurisdiction, from taxes and common burdens, &c.) which ought not to be done without his licence and authority.

So that the oriental bishops had good reason to tell the emperor that "it was impossible, without his authority, to order the matters under consideration with good law and order."*

It is nowise reasonable that any other should have this power, it being inconsistent with public peace that in one state there should be two legislative powers; which might clash the one with the other, the one enacting functions prejudicial to the interest and will of the other: wherefore the Pope being then a citizen of Rome, and a subject to the emperor, could not have a legislative power, or a negative vote in synods, but that wholly did belong to the imperial authority.

But it is opposed that some synods have been declared invalid for want of the Pope's confirmation; for to the decrees of the synod at Ariminum it was excepted that they were null, because the bishop of Rome did not consent to them:† "There could not (say the Roman synod in Theodoret) be any prejudice from the number of those assembled in Ariminum, it being plain that neither the Roman bishop, whose suffrage ought first to have been received, nor Vicentius, who for so many years did hold his episcopacy blameless, nor others agreeing to such things."‡ To which exception I answer, that

1. That which is alleged against the synod of Ariminum is not the defect of the Pope's confirmation subsequent, but of his consent and concurrence before it or in it; which is very reasonable, because he had a right to be present, and to concur in all such assemblies, especially being so eminent a bishop.

2. The same exception every bishop might allege, all having a like right and common interest to vote in those assemblies.

3. Accordingly the dissent of other bishops, particularly of those eminent in dignity or merit, is also alleged in exception; which had been needless, if his alone dissent had been of so very peculiar force.

4. The emperor, and many other bishops, did not know of any peculiar necessity of his confirmation.

Again it may be objected that Popes have voided the decrees of general synods, as did Pope Leo the decrees of the synod of Chalcedon, concerning the privileges of the Constantinopolitan see, in these blunt words; "But the agreements of bishops

* Rel. Orient. ad Imp. Act. Syn. Eph. p. 372.
† Soz. vi. 23. ‡ Theod. ii. 22.

repugnant to the holy canons made at Nice, your faith and piety joining with us, we make void, and by the authority of the blessed Apostle St. Peter, by a general determination we disannul:"* and in his epistle to those of that synod, "For however vain conceit may arm itself with extorted compliances, and think its wilfulness sufficiently strengthened with the name of councils: yet whatever is contrary to the canons of the above-named Fathers will be weak and void."† Lastly, in his epistle to Maximus, bishop of Antioch, he says, "He has such a reverence for the Nicene Canons, that he will not permit or endure that what those holy Fathers have determined be by any novelty violated."‡

This behavior of Pope Leo,§ (although applauded and imitated by some of his successors) I doubt not to except against in behalf of the synod, that it was disorderly, factious, and arrogant, (proceeding indeed from ambition and jealousy;) the leading act of high presumption in this kind, and one of the seeds of that exorbitant ambition, which did at length overwhelm the dignity and liberty of the Christian republic: yet for somewhat qualifying the business it is observable that he did ground his repugnancy and pretended annulling of that decree, (or of decrees concerning discipline,) not so much on his authority to cross general synods, as on the inviolable firmness and everlasting obligation of the Nicene canons; the which he (although against the reason of things, and rules of government) did presume no synod could abrogate or alter. In fine, this opposition of his did prove ineffectual by the sense and practice of the Church, maintaining its ground against his pretence.

It is an unreasonable thing that the opinion or humor of one man (no wiser or better commonly than others) should be preferred before the common agreement of his brethren, being of the same office and order with him; so that he should be able to overthrow and frustrate the result of their meetings and consultations, when it did not square to his conceit or interest; especially seeing there is not the least appearance of any right he hath to such a privilege, grounded in holy Scripture, tradition, or custom: for seeing that Scripture hath not a syllable about general synods, seeing that no rule about them is extant

* P. Leo I. Ep. 55. (ad Pulcher. Aug.)

† Ep. 61. (ad Syn. Chalced.)

‡ Leo. Ep. 62. (ad Max. Antioch.)

§ P. Gelas. Ep. 13. (ad Episc. Dard.) p. 642. et in Tract. de Anathem. (p. 647.) P. Pelag. II. Ep. 5. (ad Eliam.) p. 474.—Greg. M. Ep.

in any of the first Fathers, till after three hundred years, seeing there was not one such council celebrated till after that time, seeing in none of the first general synods any such canon was framed in favor of that bishop, what ground of right could the Pope have to prescribe unto them, or thwart their proceedings? Far more reason there is, (in conformity to all former rules and practice,) that he should yield to all his brethren, than that all his brethren should submit to him: and this we see to have been the judgment of the Church, declared by its practice in the cases before touched.

IV. It is indeed a proper endowment of an absolute sovereignty, immediately and immutably constituted by God, with no terms or rules limiting it, that its will declared in way of precept, proclamations, concerning the sanctions of laws, the abrogation of them, the dispensation with them, should be observed.

This privilege therefore in a high strain the Pope challengeth to himself; asserting to his decrees and sentences the force and obligation of laws; so that the body of that canon law, whereby he pretendeth to govern the Church, doth in greatest part consist of papal edicts, or decretal epistles, imitating the rescripts of emperors, and bearing the same force.

In Gratian we have these aphorisms from Popes concerning this their privilege.

"No person ought to have either the will or the power to transgress the precepts of the apostolic see."*

"——Those things which by the apostolic see have at several times been written for the Catholic faith, for sound doctrines, for the various and manifold exigency of the Church, and the manners of the faithful, how much rather ought they to be preferred in all honor, and by all men altogether, on all occasions whatsoever to be reverently received!"†

"Those decretal epistles which most holy Popes have at divers times given out from the city of Rome, on their being consulted with by divers bishops, we decree that they be received with veneration."‡

"If ye have not the decrees of the bishops of Rome, ye are to be accused of neglect and carelessness; but if ye have them, yet observe them not, ye are to be chidden and rebuked for your temerity."§

* P. Greg. IV. Dist. xix. cap. 5.

† P. Nic. I. Epist. Dist. xix. cap. 1.

‡ P. Gelas. I. (in decreto) lit. a Nic. P. Ep. 42. ad Epist. Galliæ. Dist. xix. cap. 1.

§ P. Nic. I. Ep. 6. ad Phot. Dist. xx. cap. 2.

"All the sanctions of the apostolic see are so to be understood, as if confirmed by the voice of St. Peter himself."*

"Because the Roman church, over which by the will of Christ we do preside, is proposed for a mirror and example; whatsoever it doth determine, whatsoever that doth appoint, is perpetually and irrrefragably to be observed by all men."†

"We who according to the plenitude of our power have a right to dispense above law or right."‡

"This see—that which it might do by its own sole authority, it is often pleased to define by consent of its priests."§

But this power he doth assume and exercise merely on usurpation, and unwarrantably; having no ground for it in original right or ancient practice.

Originally the Church hath no other general lawgiver, beside our one Lord and one Lawgiver.

As to practice we may observe

1. Anciently (before the first general synod) the Church had no other laws, beside the divine laws; or those || which were derived from the Apostles by traditional custom; or those which each church did enact for itself in provincial synods; or which were propagated from one church to another by imitation and compliance; or which in like manner were framed and settled.

Whence, according to different traditions, or different reasons and circumstances of things, several churches did vary in points of order and discipline.

The Pope then could not impose his traditions, laws, or customs on any church; if he did attempt it, he was liable to suffer a repulse; as is notorious in the case, when Pope Victor would (although rather as a doctor than as a lawgiver) have reduced the churches of Asia to conform with the Roman, in the time of celebrating Easter; wherein he found not only stout resistance, but sharp reproof.

In St. Cyprian's time every bishop had a free power, according to his discretion to govern his church; and it was deemed a tyrannical enterprise for one to prescribe to another, or to require obedience from his colleagues; as otherwhere by many clear allegations out of that holy man we have showed:

* P. Agatho. Dist. xix. cap. 2. Vid. Syn. VI. Act. iv. p. 35.

† P. Steph. (Dist. xix. cap. 3.) P. Gelas. I. Ep. 9. De Dispens. (p. 633.)

‡ P. Inn. III. Decret. Greg. lib. iii. tit. 8. cap. 4.

§ P. Nic. I. Ep. 18. (ad Carolum R.) Leo I. Ep. i. cap. 5. P. Hilarius in Conc. Rom. p. 578. &c.

|| Syn. Constantinop. can. 2.

"For none of us," saith he, "makes himself a bishop of bishops, or by a tyrannical terror compels his colleagues to a necessity of obedience; since every bishop, according to the licence of his own liberty and power, hath his own freedom, and can no more be judged by another, than he himself can judge another."*

If any new law were then introduced, or rule determined for common practice, it was done by the general agreement of bishops, or of a preponderant multitude among them, to whom the rest out of modesty and peaceableness did yield compliance; according to that saying of the Roman clergy to St. Cyprian, (on occasion of the debate concerning the manner of admitting lapsed persons to communion,) "That decree cannot be valid, that hath not the consent of the major part."†

The whole validity of such laws or rules did indeed wholly stand on presumption of such consent; whereby the common liberty and interest was secured.

2. After that by the emperor's conversion the Church, enjoying secular protection and encouragement, did reduce itself, as into a closer union and freer communication of parts, so into a greater uniformity of practice; especially by means of great synods,‡ wherein (the governors and representatives of all churches being called unto them, and presumed to concur in them) were ordained sanctions, taken to oblige all; the Pope had indeed a greater stroke than formerly, as having the first place in order, or privilege of honor, in ecclesiastical assemblies, where he did concur; yet had no casting vote, or real advantage above others: all things passing by majority of vote; this is supposed as notorious in the acts of the fifth council: "This," say they "is a thing to be granted, that in councils we must not regard the interlocution of one or two, but those things which are commonly defined by all, or by the most."§

So also in the fifth council, George, bishop of Constantinople, saith that "seeing every where the council of the multitude, or of the most, doth prevail, it is necessary to anathematise the persons before mentioned."‖

3. Metropolitan bishops in their provinces had far more power, and more surely grounded, than the Pope had in the whole Church, (for the metropolitans had an unquestioned authority, settled by custom, and confirmed by synodical decrees,) yet had not they a negative voice in synodical debates:

* Cypr. in Conc. Carthag.
† Cler. Rom. ad Cypr. (Epist. 31.) ‡ Ibid.
§ Concil. v. Collat. 6. p. 263. ‖ VI. Syn. Act. xvi. p. 249.

for it is decreed in the Nicene synod, that in the designation of bishops, (which was the principal affair in ecclesiastical administrations,) 'plurality of votes should prevail.'*

It is indeed there said that none should be ordained, χωρὶς γνώμης, 'without the opinion of the metropolitan:' but that doth not import a negative voice in him, but that the transaction should not pass in his absence, or without his knowlege, advice, and suffrage: for so the Apostolical Canon (to which the Nicene Fathers there did allude and refer, meaning to interpret it) doth appoint that the metropolitan should do nothing ἄνευ τῆς πάντων γνώμης, without the opinion of all,† that is, without suffrage of the most, concluding all; (for surely that canon doth not give to each one a negative voice.) And so the synod of Antioch (held soon after that of Nice, which therefore knew best the sense of the Nicene Fathers, and how the custom went) doth interpret it, decreeing that "a bishop should not be ordained without a synod, and the presence of the metropolitan of the province;"‡ in which synod yet they determine that "plurality of votes should carry it;"§ no peculiar advantage in the case being granted to the metropolitan.

Seeing therefore provincial synods were more ancient than general, and gave pattern to them; if we did grant the same privilege to the Pope in general synods, as the metropolitans had in provincial, (which yet we cannot do with any good reason or ground,) yet could not the Pope thence pretend to an authority of making laws by himself.

4. It was then a passable opinion that he, as one, was in reason obliged to yield to the common judgment of his colleagues and brethren; as the emperor Constantius told Pope Liberius, that "the vote of the plurality of bishops ought to prevail."‖

5. When Pope Julius did seem to cross a rule of the Church, by communicating with persons condemned by synods, the Fathers of Antioch did "smartly recriminate against him, showing that they were not to receive canons from him."¶

6. So far was the Pope from prescribing laws to others, that he was looked on as subject to the laws of the Church no less than others; as the Antiochene Fathers did suppose, "complaining to Pope Julius of his transgressing the canons:"** the which charge he doth not repel by pretending exemption, but by declaring that he had not offended against the canons, and

* Conc. Nic. can. 6. † Apost. can. 34. ‡ Syn. Ant. Can. 19.
§ Ibid. ‖ Theod. ii. 16. ¶ Socr. ii. 15.
** P. Julii Epist. apud Athanas. in Apol. ii. p. 748.

retorting the accusation against themselves; as the African Fathers supposed, when they told Pope Celestine, that he could not admit persons to communion, which had been excommunicated by them, that being contrary to a decree of the Nicene synod;* as the Roman church supposed itself, when it told Marcian, that they could not receive him without leave of his father who had rejected him.† This the whole tenor of ecclesiastical canons showeth, they running in a general style, never excepting the Pope from the laws prescribed to other bishops.

7. The privilege of dispensing with laws had then been a strange hearing, when the Pope could in no case dispense with himself for infringing them, without bringing clamor and censure on him.‡

8. It had indeed been a vain thing for synods with so much trouble and solemnity to assemble, if the Pope without them could have framed laws, or could with a puff of his mouth have blown away the results of them by dispensation.

9. Even in the growth of papal dominion, and after that the seeds of Roman ambition had sprouted forth to a great bulk, yet had not Popes the heart or face openly to challenge power over the universal canons, or exemption from them; but pretended to be the chief observers, guardians, defenders, and executors of them; or of the rights and privileges of churches established by them: for while any footsteps of ancient liberty, simplicity, and integrity did remain, a claim of paramount or lawless authority would have been very ridiculous and very odious. Pope Zosimus I.§ denieth that he could alter the privileges of churches.

10. If they did talk more highly, requiring observance to their constitutions, it was either in their own precinct, or in the provinces where they had a more immediate jurisdiction, or in some corners of the west, where they had obtained more sway; and in some cases, wherein their words were backed with other inducements to obedience; for the Popes were commonly 'wise in their generations,' accommodating their discourse to the state of times and places.

11. It is also to be observed that often the Popes are supposed to speak and constitute things by their own authority, which indeed were done by synods, consisting of western bishops

* Epist. ad P. Celest. I. † Epiph. Hær. 42.

‡ P. Leo I. Ep. 62.

§ P. Zos. I. Ep. 7. (ad Episc. Vienn. et Narb.) Caus. xxv. qu. i. cap. 7.

more closely adhering to that see, in regard to those regions;* the decrees of which synods were binding in those places, not so much by virtue of papal authority, as proceeding from the consent of their own bishops: how ready soever he were to assume all to himself, pretending those decrees as precepts of the apostolical see.

Whence all the acts of modern Popes are invalid, and do not oblige, seeing they do not act in synod; but only of their own head, or with the advice of a few partisans about them, men linked in common interest with them to domineer over the Church.

12. Yet even in the western countries, in later times, their decrees have been contested, when they did seem plainly to clash with the old canons, or much to derogate from the liberties of churches; nor have there wanted learned persons in most times, who, so far as they durst, have expressed their dislike of this usurpation.

"For although the bishop of Rome be more venerable than the rest that are in the world, on account of the dignity of the apostolical see, yet it is not lawful for him in any case to transgress the order of canonical governance: for as every bishop who is of the orthodox Church, and the spouse of his own see, doth intirely represent the person of our Saviour; so generally no bishop ought pragmatically to act any thing in another's diocese.†

13. In the times of Pope Nicholas I. the Greeks did not admit the Roman decrees; so that Pope in an epistle to Photius complains‡ "that he did not receive the decrees of the Popes, whenas yet they ordained nothing but what the natural, what the Mosaical, and what the law of grace required."§ And in another epistle he expostulates with him for saying that "they neither had nor did observe the decrees made by the holy Popes of the prime see of the Roman church."‖

14. That which greatly did advance the papal jurisdiction, and introduced his usurpation of obtruding new decrees on the Church, was the venting of the forged Decretal Epistles under the name of old Popes; which when the Pope did allege for authorising his practices, the French bishops, endeavoring to

* Conc. Eph. p. 332.

N. The Pope did in those councils ask the placets. P. Hil. in Conc. R. (p. 578.)

† Glab. Rod. 2. 4. Vid. Baron. ann. 996. sect. 22. 23.

‡ Circa an. 860. § P. Nic. I. Ep. 11. (ad Phot.)

‖ Id. Ep. 6. (ad Phot.)

assert their privileges, did allege that "they were not contained in the whole body of their canons."*

15. The power of enacting and dispensing with ecclesiastical laws, touching exterior discipline, did of old belong to the emperor. And it was reasonable that it should; because old laws might not conveniently suit with the present state of things and the public welfare; because new laws might conduce to the good of Church and State, the care of which is incumbent on him; because the prince is bound to use his power and authority to promote God's service, the best way of doing which may be by framing orders conducible thereto.

Accordingly the emperors did enact divers laws concerning ecclesiastical matters, which we see extant in the Codes of Theodosius and Justinian.

"These things," saith the Council of Arles, "we have decreed to be presented to our lord the emperor, desiring his clemency, that if any thing be defective, it may be supplied by his prudence; if any thing be unreasonable, it may be corrected by his judgment; if any thing be reasonably ordered, it may by his help, the divine grace assisting, be perfected."†

We may observe that Popes did allow the validity of imperial laws. Pope Gregory I.‡ doth allege divers laws of divers emperors concerning ecclesiastical affairs, as authentic and obligatory rules of practice.

16. Divers churches had particular rights of independency on all power without themselves.

Such as the church of Cyprus in the Ephesine synod did claim and obtain the confirmation of.

Such was the ancient church of Britain before Austin came into England.

"The Welsh bishops are consecrated by the bishop of St. David's, and he himself in like manner is ordained by others, who are, as it were, his suffragans, professing no manner of subjection to any other church."§

V. Sovereign power, immediately by itself, when it pleaseth, doth exercise all parts of jurisdiction, setting itself in the tribunal; or mediately doth execute it by others, as its officers or commissioners.

Wherefore now the Pope doth claim and exercise universal jurisdiction over all the clergy;‖ requiring of them engagements

* P. Nic. I. Ep. 42. (ad Galliæ Episc.)
† Conc. Arel. iv. cap. 26. ann. 813. (sub Carolo M.)
‡ P. Greg. I. Ep. xi. 56. § Girald. Cambr. Itin. ii. 1.
‖ Bell. ii. 18. 26.

of strict submission and obedience to him; demanding that all causes of weight be referred to him; citing them to his bar, examining and deciding their causes; condemning, suspending, deposing, censuring them, or acquitting, absolving, restoring them, as he seeth cause, or findeth in his heart;* he doth encourage people to accuse their pastors to him, in case any doth infringe his laws and orders.

But (in general) that originally or anciently the Pope had no such right appropriate to him may appear by arguments, by cross instances, by the insufficiency of all pleas, and examples alleged in favor of this claim. For,

1. Originally there was not at all among Christians any jurisdiction like to that which is exercised in civil governments, and which now the papal court doth execute. For this our Saviour did prohibit, and St. Peter forbad the presbyters *κατακυριεύειν τῶν κλήρων*. And St. Chrysostom affirmeth the episcopal power not to be *αὐθεντία*,, or *ἀρχή*. And ecclesiastical history doth inform us that such a jurisdiction was lately introduced in the Church, as by other great bishops, so especially by the bishop of Rome: "For," saith Socrates, "from that time the episcopacy of Alexandria, beyond the sacerdotal order, did assume a domineering power in affairs."†

The which kind of power the Roman bishops had long before assumed; for, saith he, "the episcopacy of Rome, in like manner as that of Alexandria, had already a great while ago gone before in a domineering power beyond that of the priesthood."‡

At first the episcopal power did only consist in paternal admonition, and correption of offenders, exhorting and persuading them to amendment; and in case they contumaciously did persist in disorderly behavior, bringing them before the congregation; and the cause being there heard and proved, with its consent imposing such penance or correction on them as seemed needful for the public good, or their particular benefit; "All things," saith St. Cyprian, "shall be examined, you being present and judging:"§ and, (elsewhere,) "according to your divine suffrages; according to your pleasure.' ‖

2. Originally no one bishop had any jurisdiction over another, or authority to judge his actions; as St. Cyprian (who well knew the current judgment and practice of his age) in many places doth affirm; who particularly doth reflect on the Roman

* P. Gelas. I. Ep. 4. † Socr. vii. 7.
‡ Ibid. 11. § Cypr. Ep. 12. (fratribus in plebe.)
‖ Cypr. Ep. 40.

bishop, for presuming to censure his brethren, who dissented from him; "Let us all," saith he, "expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who only hath power to prefer us to the government of his Church, and to judge of what we do."*

3. Even the community of bishops did not otherwise take notice of, or intermeddle with, the proceedings of any bishop in his precinct and charge; except when his demeanor did concern the general state of the Church, intrenching on the common faith, or public order and peace.

In other cases, for one or more bishops to meddle with the proceedings of their brother, was taken for an ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπία, a pragmatical intrusion on another's business; and an invasion of that liberty which did belong to each bishop, by the grant of our Lord, and the nature of his office.

As by those passages of St. Cyprian, and the declaration of the synod with him, doth appear.

4. In cases needing decision for the public good of the Church, the law and custom of the Church, confirmed by the Nicene synod, did order that jurisdiction should be exercised, and all causes finally determined in each province; so that no regard is had to the Pope, no exception in favor of him being expressed or implied.†

The which constitution, if we believe Pope Leo himself, cannot in any case by any power be revoked or infringed.‡

That is most expressly confirmed by the synod of Antioch, in the code of the universal Church; "If any bishop accused of certain crimes shall be condemned by all the bishops in the province, and all shall unanimously vote against him, he shall not be judged again by others; but the unanimous sentence of the bishops of the province shall remain valid."§

Here is no consideration or exception of the Pope.

5. Accordingly in practice, synods, without regard or recourse to the Pope, did judge bishops on offences charged against them.

6. The execution of those judgments was intrusted to metropolitan bishops; or had effect by the people's consent; for it being declared that any bishop had incurred condemnation, the people did presently desert him.

Every bishop was obliged to confer his part to the execution; as Pope Gelasius affirmeth.‖

7. If the Pope had such judicial power, seeing there were

* Cypr. in Conc. Carth. † Can. 5.
‡ P. Felix Acacio. apud Baron. ann. 484. sect. 17.
§ Syn. Ant. Can. 16. ‖ P. Gelas. I. Ep. 4.

from the beginning so many occasions of exercising it, there would have been extant in history many clear instances of it; but few can be alleged, and those (as we shall see) impertinent or insufficient.

8. Divers synods (great and smaller) did make sanctions contrary to this pretence of the Pope; appointing the decision of causes to be terminated in each diocese, and prohibiting appeals to him; which they would not have done, if the Pope had originally, or according to common law and custom, a supreme judicial power.

9. The most favorable of ancient synods to papal interest, that of Sardica, did confer on the Pope a power, qualified in matter and manner, of causing episcopal causes to be revised; which showeth that before he had no right in such cases, nor then had an absolute power.

10. The Pope's power of judging bishops hath been of old disclaimed as an illegal and upstart encroachment.

When the Pope first nibbled at this bait of ambition, St. Cyprian and his bishops did reprehend him for it.

The bishop of Constantinople denied that Pope Gelasius alone might condemn him; according to the canons—* the Pope ranteth at it, and reasoneth against it; but hath no material argument or example for it, (concerning the papal authority peculiarly,) beside the Sardican canon.

11. The Popes themselves have been judged for misdemeanor, heresy, schism; as hereafter we shall show.

12. The Popes did execute some judgments, only by a right common to all bishops, as executors of synodical decrees."†

13. Other bishops did pretend to judicature, by privilege: as Juvenalis, bishop of Jerusalem, did pretend that to him did belong the judgment of the bishop of Antioch.‡

14. The Popes were subject to the Emperors; who, when they pleased, did interpose to direct or qualify all jurisdiction; commanding the Popes themselves—wherefore the Popes were not judges sovereign, but subordinate.

Pope Gregory I. did refer the great question about the title of œcumenical bishop to the judgment of the emperor Mauricius.§

These things will more fully appear in the discussion of the particulars concerning the chief branches of jurisdiction; more especially under the tenth branch of sovereignty.

* P. Gelas. I. Ep. 4.
† Ibid. (supr. in Arg. 6.) Vid. Epist. 13.
‡ Syn. Eph. Act. iv. (p. 400.) § Greg. Ep. iv. 22

They allege that passage of Valentinian in his epistle to Theodosius, "That the most blessed bishop of Rome, to whom antiquity hath given a priesthood over all, hath a see and power to judge both of faith and priests."*

This was suggested by Pope Leo and his adherents to the young emperor; but it signifieth no more, but that in the judgment of priests (as of faith) he was to have his share, or at most to be a leading person therein.

Theodosius (a mature, grave, pious prince) did not regard that pretence of Leo, nor the appeal of Flavianus.†

VI. To the sovereign of any state belongeth the choice, constitution, confirmation, commissionating of all inferior magistrates; that none uncapable, unworthy, or unfit for offices, or disaffected to the state, be intrusted with the management of affairs.

Wherefore the Pope doth claim and exercise these prerogatives so far as he can; pretending at least that no bishop can be constituted without his designation, or his licence, and his confirmation of the nomination, collation, or election.

And these privileges by the great advocates are on highest terms asserted to him.‡

In this matter may be distinguished,

1. The designation of the person by election, or otherwise.
2. The confirmation of that.
3. The ordination or consecration of him to his office; the which conferreth on him his character and authority.
4. The authority by which he acteth.

Into all these the Pope hath intruded himself, and he will have a finger in them.

1. He gladly would have drawn to himself the collation and disposal of all benefices, challenging a general right to dispose of all at his pleasure:§ but not having been able wholly to deprive princes and patrons of their nominations, and corporations of their election; yet he hath by reservations, provisions, collations of vacancies *apud sedem*, resignations, devolutions, and other such tricks, extremely encroached on the rights of all, to the infinite vexation, damage, and mischief of Christendom.

2. He pretendeth that no bishop shall be ordained without his licence.

3. He obligeth the person ordained to swear obedience to him.

* Act. Syn. Chalc. p. 25. † Ibid. p. 28.
‡ Bell. iv. 24.
§ Clem. IV. in Sexto, lib. iii. tit. 4. cap. 2. Vid. ibid. cap. iv. 10. xii. 20

4. He pretendeth that all bishops are his ministers and deputies.

But no such privileges have any foundation or warrant in holy Scripture, in ancient doctrine, or in primitive usage: they are all encroachments on the original rights and liberties of the Church, derived from ambition and avarice; subsisting on usurpation, upheld by violence.

This will appear from a survey of ancient rules and practices concerning this matter.

The first constitution after our Lord's decease of an ecclesiastical person was that of Matthias into the vacant apostolate, or bishopric of Judas;* wherein (on St. Peter's motion) 'all the disciples present did by consent present two;'† 'out of whom God himself did elect one,'‡ by determining the lot to fall on Matthias; so that this designation being partly human, partly divine, so far as it was human, it went by free election of the whole fraternity; and St. Peter, beside generally suggesting the matter to be done, did assume nothing peculiar to himself.

The next constitution we meet with is that of deacons to assist the Apostles and elders in discharge of inferior offices; wherein the Apostles did commit the designation of the persons to the 'multitude of the disciples, who elected them;' and presented them to the Apostles, who, 'by prayer and laying on of hands, did ordain them.' Nor had St. Peter in this action any particular stroke.

As to the constitution of bishops, in the first apostolical times the course was this: the Apostles, and apostolical persons, (who were authorised by the Apostles to act with their power, and in their stead,) did in churches founded by them constitute bishops, such as divine inspiration, or their grace of discretion did guide them to;§ so did St. John in Asia, "setting those apart for the clergy whom the Spirit had marked out."‖

This was not done without the consent of the Christian people, as Clemens Romanus telleth us in his excellent Epistle to the Corinthians;¶ but he doth not acquaint us (although he were himself bishop of Rome) that the Pope had any thing to do in such constitutions, or in confirmations of them; 'the whole Church,' saith he, 'consenting;' why doth he not add, for his own sake, 'and the Pope confirming?'

* Act i. 20. † Ver. 23. ‡ Ver. 24.
§ Tit. i. 5. 1 Cor. xii. 10. ‖ Eus. iii. 23.
¶ Clem. Epist. p. 57.

In the next times, when those extraordinary persons and faculties had expired, when usually the churches planted were in situation somewhat incoherent and remote from each other, on a vacancy the clergy and people of each church did elect its bishop; in which action commonly the clergy did propound and recommend a person or persons, and the people by their consent approve, or by their suffrages elect one;* a strict examination of his life and doctrine intervening: the which order Tertullian briefly doth intimate in those words, "The presidents of the Church are certain elders well approved, who have obtained that honor, not by price, but by proof."†

It may be inquired, how a bishop then was ordained, in case his city was very remote from any other churches?

Did they send for bishops from distant places to ordain him? Or did the presbyters of the place lay their hands on him? Or did he receive no other ordination than that he had before of presbyter? Or did he abide no bishop till opportunity did yield bishops to ordain him? Or did Providence order that there should be no such solitary churches? The ancient commentator, contemporary to St. Ambrose, and bearing his name, did conceive that on decease of a bishop the elder of the presbyters did succeed into his place.‡ Whence had he this, out of his invention and conjecture, or from some tradition and history?

Afterward, when the faith was diffused through many provinces, that churches grew thick and close, the general practice was this: the neighbor bishops (being advertised of a vacancy, or want of a bishop) did convene at the place; then in the congregation the clergy of the place did propound a person, yielding their attestation to his fitness for the charge; which the people hearing did give their suffrages, accepting him, if no weighty cause was objected against him; or refusing him, if such cause did appear: then on such recommendation and acceptance, the bishops present did adjoin their approbation and consent; then by their devotions, and solemn laying on of their hands, they did ordain or consecrate him to the function.

Of this course most commonly practised in his time we have divers plain testimonies in St. Cyprian, the best author extant concerning these matters of ancient discipline: "For which reason," saith he, "that from divine tradition and apostolical observation is to be observed and held, which also is with us, and almost through all provinces, kept; that for duly celebrat-

* 1 Tim. iii. 10. † Tertul. Apol. 39.
‡ Vid. Dist. lxvi. cap. 2.

ing ordinations unto that people, for whom a bishop is ordained, all the neighbor bishops of the same (province or people) should resort; and a bishop should be chosen, the people being present, which most fully knoweth the life of each one, and hath from his conversation a thorough insight into his practice; the which we see done with you in the ordination of our colleague Sabinus, that by the suffrage of all the fraternity, and by the judgment of all the bishops which had assembled in the presence, and had sent letters to you about him, the bishopric should be deferred to him."*

Again, "A people obedient to the Lord's commands, and fearing God, ought to separate itself from a wicked bishop, (such a notoriously wicked bishop as those were of whom he treateth, who had renounced the faith,) and not to mingle itself with the sacrifices of a sacrilegious priest; seeing especially that it hath a power either to choose worthy priests, or to refuse those who are unworthy; the which also we see to descend from divine authority, that a bishop should be chosen, the people being present, before the eyes of all; and that he who is worthy and fit should be approved by public judgment and testimony."†

Again, when (saith he concerning himself) "a bishop is substituted in the place of one deceased, when he is peaceably chosen by the suffrage of all the people;"—and "whom, if according to the divine instructions the whole fraternity would obey, no man would move any thing against the college of priests; none after the divine judgment, after the suffrage of the people, after the consent of the fellow-bishop, would make himself judge, not indeed of the bishop, but of God."‡

Again, "Cornelius was made bishop by the judgment of God and his Christ, by the testimony of almost all the clergy, by the suffrage of the people, being then present, and by the college of priests, ancient and good men:"§ and, "Cornelius being in the Catholic church ordained by the judgment of God, and by the suffrage of the clergy and people."‖

Again, "When a bishop is once made, and is approved by the testimony and the judgment of his colleagues, and of the people——."¶

The author of the Apostolical Constitutions** thus in the person of St. Peter very fully and clearly describeth the manner of ordination of bishops in his times: "After one of the chief bishops present has thus prayed, the rest of the priests

* Cypr. Ep. 68. † Cypr. Ep. ‡ Cypr. Ep. 55. § Ibid. 52.
‖ Ibid. 67. ¶ Ep. 41. (ad Cornel.) ** viii. 4.

with all the people shall say, Amen; and after the prayer, one of the bishops shall deliver the Eucharist into the hands of the person ordained, and that morning he shall be placed by the rest of the bishops in his throne, all of them saluting him with a kiss in the Lord. After the reading of the Law and Prophets, of our Epistles, the Acts and Gospel, he who is ordained shall salute the Church with these words, The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God the Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you all, Amen. And let all answer, And with thy spirit. After which words let him exhort the people."

Thus it was then, in a practice so obvious and observable, that a pagan emperor took good notice of it, and chose to imitate it in constituting the governors of provinces, and other officers; "When" (saith Lampridius of Alexander Severus) "he would either give rulers to provinces, or make presidents, or ordain procurators, he set up their names, exhorting the people, if they had any thing against them, to prove it by manifest evidence; if they could not make their accusation good, they were to die for it: and he said it would be hard not to do that in the choice of governors of provinces, to whom the lives and fortunes of men were intrusted, which the Christians and Jews did in setting up those who were to be ordained priests."*

Afterward, in process of time, when (the gaps of distance being filled up, and Christendom becoming one continued body) ecclesiastical discipline was improved into a more complete shape, for constitution of a bishop, all the bishops of a province did convene, (or such as could with convenience, the others signifying their mind by writing,) and having approved him who was recommended by the clergy, and allowed by the people, they did ordain him; the metropolitan of the province ratifying what was done.

So the Nicene synod, regarding the practice which had commonly obtained, did appoint, with a qualification to be generally observed:† "It is most fit," say they, "that a bishop be constituted by all bishops in the province; but if this be hard, either because of urgent necessity, or for the length of the way, then three of the body being gathered together, (those also who are absent conspiring in opinion, and yielding their consent in writing,) let the ordination be performed, but let the ratification of what is done be assigned to the metropolite in each province."‡

* Lamprid. in Alex. Sev. cap. 45.

† Vid. Can. Apost. 1. Conc. Antioch. Can. 19 Conc. Laod. Can. 12—. Conc. Afr. Can. 13. ‡ Conc. Nic can. 4.

In this canon (the which is followed by divers canons of other synods) there is no express mention concerning the interest of the clergy and people in election of the bishops; but these things are only passed over, as precedaneous to the constitution or ordination, about which only the Fathers did intend to prescribe; supposing the election to proceed according to former usual practice.

That we ought thus to interpret the canon, so that the Fathers did not intend to exclude the people from their choice, doth appear from their synodical epistle; wherein they decree concerning bishops constituted by Meletius, who, returning to communion with the Church, did live in any city, that, "If any Catholic bishop should happen to die, then should those who were already received ascend into the honor of him deceased; in case they should appear worthy, and the people should choose, the bishop of Alexandria withal adding his suffrage to him, and his confirmation:"* the which words with sufficient evidence do interpret the canon not to concern the election, but the ordination of bishops.

Thus the Fathers of the second general synod plainly did interpret this canon by their proceeding;† for they, in their synodical epistle to Pope Damasus and the western bishops, did assure him that they in the constitution of bishops for the principal eastern sees, had followed this order of the synod of Nice, together with "the ancient law of the Church;" in agreement whereto they had ordained Nectarius bishop of Constantinople, "with common consent, under the eyes of the most religious emperor Theodosius, and of all the clergy, the whole city adjoining also its suffrage;" and that for Antioch, "the bishops of the province, and of the eastern diocese concurring, had canonically ordained Flavianus bishop, the whole Church consenting, as with one voice, to honor the person."

Indeed the practice generally doth confirm this, the people every where continuing to elect their bishop;‡ so did the people of Alexandria demand Athanasius for their bishop. So Pope Julius did complain that Gregory was intruded into the place of Athanasius; "not being required by the presbyters, not by the bishops, not by the people."§ So Gregory Nazianzen describeth the elections of bishops in his times to be carried by the power of wealthy men, and impetuousness of the people.‖ So Austin intimateth the same in his speech about designation

* Socr. i. 9. Theod. i. 9.
† Theod. v. 9.
‡ Ath. Apol. ii. p. 726.
§ Ath. ibid. p. 749.
‖ Orat. xix. 310. Epist. 21.

of a successor to himself: "I know," says he, "that after the decease of bishops the churches are wont to be disturbed by ambitious and contentious men."* So the tumults at Antioch, in choosing a bishop after Eustathius; at Rome, after Liberius; at Constantinople, after Alexander; at Milan, when St. Ambrose was chosen.†

So Stephanus, bishop of Ephesus, in justification of himself, saith, "Me forty bishops of Asia, by the suffrage of the most noble and of the substantial citizens, and of all the most reverend clergy, and of all the rest of the whole city, did ordain;"‡ and his competitor Bassianus, "Me, with great constraint and violence, the people and the clergy, and the bishops, did install."§

In the synod of Chalcedon, Eusebius, bishop of Ancyra, saith, "the whole city of Gangra did come to him, bringing their suffrages:"‖ Posidius telleth us of St. Austin, that "in ordaining priests and clergymen he deemed the greater consent of Christians, and the custom of the Church, was to be followed."¶

So Celestine the First; "Let no bishop be given them against their wills; let the consent and request of the clergy, the people, and the order, be expected:"** and Pope Leo the First; "When there shall be an election of a bishop, let him be preferred who has the unanimous consent of the clergy and people; so that if the votes be divided, and part for another person, let him, by the judgment of the metropolitan, be preferred, whose merits and interests are greatest; only that none may be ordained against their wills, or without their desire, lest the unwilling people contemn or hate a bishop whom they never desired, and become less religious than they ought, because they could not have such a bishop as they would."†† And in other of his Epistles, "There is no reason that they should be accounted bishops who were neither chosen by the clergy, nor desired by the people, nor with the metropolitan's order consecrated by the provincial bishops—."‡‡

"Certainly the desires of the citizens, and the testimonies of the people should have been expected, with the judgment of the honorable, and the choice of the clergy, which in the ordi-

* Aug. Ep. 110.

† Euseb. de Vit. Const. iii. 59. 60. Socr. i. 24. Sozom. vi. 23. Socr. i. 24. Soz. iii. 4. Theod. iv. 6.

‡ Conc. Chalc. Act. xi. p. 404.

§ Ibid.

‖ Syn. Chalc. Act. xvi. p. 462.

¶ Posid. in Aug. Vit. cap. 20.

** Celest. I. Ep. 2.

†† P. Leo I. Ep. 84. ad Anastas.

‡‡ P. Leo I. Ep. 92.

nations of priests use to be observed by those who knew the rules of the Fathers."*—"When peaceably, and with such concord as God loves, he who is to be a teacher of peace is ordained by the agreement of all."†—"Let priests who are to be ordained be required peaceably and quietly; let the subscription of the clergy, the testimony of the honorable, the consent of the order and people be observed; let him who is to preside over all be chosen by all."‡ And Pope Nicholas I. "Because we know the custom of your royal city, that none can arrive at the top of the highest priestly power without the assent of the ecclesiastical people, and the emperor's suffrage."§

Now in all these proceedings it is most apparent that there was no regard had to the Pope, or any thought of him, out of his particular territory; which he had as metropolitan, (or afterwards as primate of some parts of the west.) Nowhere else had he the least finger in the constitution of a bishop anywhere through the whole Church; no, not of the least clergyman.

When by St. Cyprian so largely and punctually the manner of constituting bishops is declared; when the Nicene Canons and those of other synods do so carefully prescribe about the ordination of them; when so many reports concerning the election of bishops do occur in history, why is there not a tittle of mention concerning any special interest of the Roman bishops about them?‖

So true is that of Alb. Crantzius; "There was no need then of apostolical confirmation; it was sufficient if the election were approved by the archbishop: now the church of Rome has assumed to herself the rights of all churches."¶

We may by the way observe that in the first times they had not so much as an absolute power of ordaining a presbyter in the church of his own city without leave of the clergy and people; as may be inferred from that passage in Eusebius, where Pope Cornelius relateth that the bishop who ordained Novatus, "being hindered from doing it by all the clergy and by many of the laity, did request that it might be granted to him to ordain that one person:"** and he that so hardly could ordain one priest in his own church, what authority could he have to constitute bishops in all other churches?

To all these evidences of fact our adversaries do oppose some

* P. Leo. Ep. 89. Dist. lxiii. cap. 27. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.
§ P. Nich. I. Ep. 5. P. Joh. VIII. Ep. lxx. Dist. 62.
‖ Vid. P. Leo. Ep. 84. 101. 107. ¶ Crantz. Metrop. vii. 45.
** P. Cornel. apud Eus. vi. 43.

instances of Popes meddling in the constitution of bishops;* as Pope Leo I. saith that Anatolius did "by the favor of his assent obtain the bishopric of Constantinople."† The same Pope is alleged as having confirmed Maximus of Antioch. The same doth write to the bishop of Thessalonica, (his vicar,) that he should "confirm the elections of bishops by his authority."‡ He also confirmed Donatus, an African bishop;—"We will that Donatus preside over the Lord's flock, on condition that he remember to send us an account of his faith."§ Also Gregory I. doth complain of it, as of an inordinate act, that a bishop of Salonæ was "ordained without his knowlege."‖ Pope Damasus did confirm the ordination of Peter Alexandrinus; "The Alexandrians," saith Sozomen, "did render the churches to Peter, being returned from Rome, with the letters of Damasus, which confirmed both the Nicene decrees, and his ordination:"¶ but what, I pray, doth confirmation here signify, but approbation? for did he otherwise confirm the Nicene decrees? did they need other confirmation?

To the former instances we answer, that being well considered they do much strengthen our argument; in that they are so few, so late, so lame, so impertinent: for if the Pope had enjoyed a power of constituting bishops, more instances of its exercise would have been producible; indeed it could not be but that history would have been full of them; the constitution of bishops being a matter of continual use, and very remarkable. At least they might have found one instance or other to allege before the times of that busy Pope Leo; in whose time, and by whose means, papal authority began to overflow its banks. And those which they produce do nowise reach home to the point; Anatolius did obtain the bishopric of Constantinople "by the help of the emperor, and by the assent of the Pope's favor:** what then? Anatolius being put into that see in the room of Flavianus, by the influence of Dioscorus, (whose responsal he had been,) and having favored the Eutychian faction, Pope Leo might thence have had a fair color to disavow him, as uncapable of that function and dignity, he being so obnoxious;†† both having such a flaw in his ordination, and having been guilty of great faults, adherence to the party of Dioscorus, and irregularly ordaining the bishop of Antioch; but he, 'out

* Bell. ii. 18. 20.
† P. Leo. Ep. 54. De Marc. iii. 14. sect. 1.
‡ P. Leo. Ep. 84. (ad Anastas.) § P. Leo. Ep. 87.
‖ Greg. Ep. iv. 34. ¶ Sozom. vi. 39.
** P. Leo. Ep. 55. (ad Martianum.)
†† P. Leo. Ep. 53. ad Anatol. Liber. cap. 12.

of regard to the emperor's intervention,' did acknowlege Anatolius for bishop: this was the favorable assent, with which he upbraideth Anatolius, having displeased him: and what doth this signify?

Again, Pope Leo did not reject Maximus, bishop of Antioch, from communion, nor disclaimed his ordination, although liable to exception:* what then? is this a confirmation of him? No such matter; it was only, which in such a vixenly Pope was a great favor, a forbearance to quarrel with him, as not duly ordained; which any other bishop might have done. If a Pope had a flaw in his ordination, another bishop might refuse him.

Again, Pope Leo did enjoin the bishop of Thessalonica to confirm ordinations; what is that to the purpose? It belonged to that bishop, as a metropolitan, by the canons, to confirm those in his province, or, as a primate, to confirm those in his diocese; it belonged to him, as the Pope's vicar in those territories, to which the Pope had stretched his jurisdiction, to execute the Pope's orders: but what is this to universal authority? It is certain that Illyricum was then in a more special manner subjected to the Pope's jurisdiction, than any of the other eastern churches; what therefore he did there, cannot be drawn into consequence as to other places.

The same may be said in answer to the complaint of Pope Gregory, and to any the like instances.

Moreover, surreptitious, presumptuous, pragmatical intrusions, or usurpations of power, do not suffice to found a right in this or any other case; to which purpose, and wholly to invalidate any such pleas, these observations may be considered.

1. There do occur divers instances of bishops, who did meddle in ordinations of other bishops, so as to bear great stroke in constituting them, who did not thereby pretend to universal jurisdiction; and it would be extremely ridiculous thence to infer they had any reasonable claim thereto.

Thus it was objected to Athanasius, "that he presumed to ordain in cities which did not belong to him."† Eusebius of Constantinople did obtrude Eusebius Emissenus to be bishop of Alexandria.‡ Eustathius of Antioch did ordain Evagrius bishop of Constantinople. Euzoius delivered unto Lucius the bishopric of Alexandria.§ Lucifer, a Sardinian bishop, did ordain Paulinus bishop of Antioch.‖ They for a *salvo* say, as

* P. Leo. Ep. 54. (ad Marcian.) Conc. Chalc. Act. 10.
† Soz. iii. 21. ‡ Soz. ii. 5. § Socr. iv. 21.
‖ Socr. iii. 6. vi. 2.

the Pope's legate; but on what ground or testimony? Why did not historians tell us so much? The Pope had then been hissed at, if he had sent legates about such errands; it was indeed out of presumption and pragmatical zeal to serve a party, then ordinary in persons addicted to all parties, right and wrong; it not being then so expressly forbidden by the canons as afterward.

Theognis and Theodorus did make Macedonius bishop of Constantinople. Theophilus of Alexandria did ordain St. Chrysostom.* The Egyptian bishops surreptitiously did constitute Maximus, the Cynic philosopher, bishop of Constantinople.† Acacius (who had as little to do there as the Pope) did thrust Eudoxius into the throne of Constantinople.‡ Meletius, of Antioch, did constitute St. Gregory Nazianzen to the charge of Constantinople.§ Acacius and Patrophilus, extruding Maximus, "did in his room constitute Cyril bishop of Jerusalem."|| Pope Leo doth complain of Anatolius, that "against the canonical rule he had assumed to himself the ordination of the bishop of Antioch."¶

2. To obviate these irregular and inconvenient proceedings, having crept in on the dissensions in faith, and especially on occasion of Gregory Nazianzen being constituted bishop of Constantinople by Meletius, and Maximus being thrust into the same see by the Egyptians, (whose party for a time the Roman church did countenance,) the second general synod did ordain that no bishop should intermeddle about ordinations without the bounds of his own diocese.

3. In pursuance of this law, or on the ground of it, the Pope was sometimes checked, when he presumed to make a sally beyond his bounds in this or the like cases.

As when Pope Innocent I. did send some bishops to Constantinople for procuring a synod to examine the cause of St. Chrysostom: "those of Constantinople—did cause them to be dismissed with disgrace, as molesting a government beyond their bounds."**

4. Even in the western parts, after that the Pope had wriggled himself into most countries there, so as to obtain sway in their transactions, yet he in divers places did not meddle in ordinations; "We do not," says Pope Leo I. "arrogate to ourselves a power of ordaining in your provinces."††

* Socr. vi. 2. † Soz. vii. 9. ‡ Socr. ii. 13.
§ Soz. vii. 2. 3. || Socr. ii. 238.
¶ P. Leo. I. Epist. 53. (ad Anatol.) ** Sozom. viii. 28.
†† P. Leo. Ep. 89.

Even in some parts of Italy itself the Pope did not confirm bishops till the times of Pope Nicholas I. as may be collected from the submission then of the bishop of Ravenna to that condition, "that he should have no power to consecrate bishops canonically elected in the regio Flaminia, unless it were granted him by letters from the apostolic see."*

And it was not without great opposition and struggling that he got that power otherwere than in his original precincts, or where the juncture of things did afford him special advantage.

5. If examples would avail to determine right, there are more, and more clear instances of emperors interposing in the constitution of bishops than of Popes; as they had ground in reason, and authority in holy Scripture: 'And Zadock the priest did the king put in the room of Abiathar.' Constantine did interpose at the designation of a bishop at Antioch in the room of Eustathius. On Gregory Nazianzen's recess from Constantinople,† Theodosius (that excellent emperor, who would not have infringed right) "did command the bishops present to write in paper the names of those whom each did approve worthy to be ordained, and reserved to himself the choice of one;"‡ and accordingly they obeying, he out of all that were nominated, "did elect Nectarius." "Constantius did deliver the see of Constantinople to Eusebius Nicomediensis."§ Constantius was angry with Macedonius, because he was ordained without his licence || He "rejecting Eleusius and Sylvanus did order other to be substituted in their places."¶ When, before St. Ambrose, the see of Milain was vacant, a synod of bishops there did entreat the emperor to declare one.** Flavianus said to the emperor Theodosius, "Give forsooth, O king, the see of Antioch to whom you shall think good."†† The emperor did call Nestorius from Antioch to the see of Constantinople;‡‡ and he was, saith Vincentius Lir. "elected by the emperor's judgment."§§ The favor of Justinian did advance Menas to the see of Constantinople:|||| and the same did prefer Eutychius thereto.¶¶ He did put in Pope Vigilius—

In Spain the kings had the election of bishops by the decrees of the council of Toledo.***

That the emperor Charles did use to confirm bishops Pope

* Plat. in P. Nichol. I.
† Euseb. de Vit. Const. iii. 59. 60. ‡ Sozom. vii. 8.
§ Id. iii. 4. || Id. iii. 6. ¶ Theodor. ii. 27.
** Id. iv. 7. †† Id. v. 23.
‡‡ Lib. Brev. 6. Socr. vii. 29. §§ Vinc. Lir. p. 330.
|||| Lib. cap. 21. ¶¶ Evag. iv. 38.
*** Conc. Tolet. xii. cap. 6. apud Gr. Dist. lxiii. cap. 25.

John VIII. doth testify, reproving the Archbishop of Verdun, for rejecting a bishop, "whom the clergy and people of the city had chosen, and the emperor Charles had confirmed by his consent."*

When Macarius, bishop of Antioch, for monothelitism was deposed in the sixth synod, the bishops under that throne did request the presidents of the synod to suggest another to the emperor to be substituted in his room.†

In Gratian there are divers passages wherein Popes declared that they could not ordain bishops to churches, even in Italy, without the emperor's leave and licence. As indeed there are also in later times other decrees,‡ (made by the Popes of another kidney, or in other junctures of affairs,) which forbid princes to meddle in the elections of bishops; as in the seventh synod, and in the eighth synod as they call it, on occasion of Photius being placed in the see of Constantinople by the power of the court. And that of Pope Nicholas I. by which discordance in practice we may see the consistence and stability of doctrine and practice in the Roman church.§

The emperors for a long time did enjoy the privilege of constituting or confirming the Popes; for, says Platina, in the Life of Pelagius II. "nothing was then done by the clergy in electing a Pope, unless the emperor approved the election."‖ He did confirm Pope Gregory I. and Pope Agatho.

"Pope Adrian, with his whole synod, did deliver to Charles the Great the right and power of electing the Pope and ordaining the apostolic see. He moreover defined that archbishops and bishops in every province should receive investiture from him; and that if a bishop were not commended and invested by the king, he should be consecrated by none; and whoever should act against his decree, him he did noose in the band of anathema."¶

The like privilege did Pope Leo VIII. attribute to the em-

* P. Joh. VIII. Ep. 70. † Syn. VI. Act. xii. (p. 208.)

‡ Dist. lxiii. cap. 9. Greg. I. Ep. iv. 15. cap. 15. 16. 17. 18. P. Leo IV. et Steph.

§ Ibid. cap. 4.

[It is a notorious thing that most princes in the West, in Germany, France, England, did invest bishops, till the time of Pope Gregory VII. when that boisterous man did raise so much stir in Christendom to dispossess them of that right; which they enjoyed, not only as princes, but as founders, patrons, benefactors, protectors of churches.]

‖ Plat. in Pelagio II. (p. 154.) Dist. 63. Plat. p. 155.

¶ Dist. lxiii. cap. 22.

peror Otho I. "We give him," says he, "for ever power to ordain a successor and bishop of the chief apostolic see, and change archbishops," &c.* And Platina, in his Life says, "That being weary of the inconstancy of the Romans, he transferred all authority to choose a Pope from the clergy and people of Rome to the Emperor."†

Now, I pray, if this power of confirming bishops do by divine institution belong to the Pope, how could he part with it, or transfer it on others? is not this a plain renunciation in Popes of their divine pretence?

6. General synods, by an authority paramount, have assumed to themselves the constitution and confirmation of bishops.‡ So the second general synod did confirm the ordination of Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, and of Flavianus, bishop of Antioch, ("this ordination," say they, "the synod generally have admitted,"§) although the Roman church did not approve the ordination of Nectarius, and for a long time after did oppose that of Flavianus. So the fifth synod, it seemeth, did confirm the ordination of Theophanius, bishop of Antioch. So the synod of Pisa did constitute Pope Alexander V. that of Constance, Pope Martin V. that of Basil, Pope Felix V.

7. All Catholic bishops in old times might, and commonly did, confirm the elections and ordinations of bishops, to the same effect as Popes may be pretended to have done; that is, by signifying their approbation or satisfaction concerning the orthodoxy of their faith, the attestation to their manners, the legality of their ordination, no canonical impediment; and consequently by admitting them to communion of peace and charity, and correspondence in all good offices, which they express by returning κοινονικαὶ ἐπιστολαὶ in answer to their synodical communicatory letters.

Thus did St. Cyprian and all the bishops of that age confirm the ordination of Pope Cornelius, being contested by novation; as St. Cyprian in terms doth affirm; "When the see of St. Peter, the sacerdotal chair, was vacant, which by the will of God being occupied, and by all our consents confirmed," &c.‖ —"to confirm thy ordination with a greater authority."¶

To which purpose, each bishop did write epistles to other bishops, (or at least to those of highest rank,) acquainting them with his ordination and instalment, making a profession

* Dist. lxiii. cap. 23. † Plat. in Leo VIII. p. 291.
‡ Conc. Const. Sess. 40. Conc. Bas. Sess. xxxvii. (p. 98.)
§ Theod. v. 9. ‖ Cypr. Ep. 52. (ad Anton.)
¶ Ep. 45. ad Corn.

of his faith, so as to satisfy them of his capacity of the function.

8. But bishops were complete bishops before they did give such an account of themselves; so that it was not in the power of the Pope, or of any others, to reverse their ordination, or dispossess them of their places. There was no confirmation importing any such matter: this is plain; and one instance will serve to show it; that of Pope Honorius, and of Sergius bishop of Constantinople, who speak of Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem; that he was constituted bishop before their knowlege, and receipt of his synodical letters.*

9. If the designation of any bishop should belong to the Pope, then especially that of metropolitans, who are the chief princes of the Church; but this anciently did not belong to him. In Afric the most ancient bishop of the province (without election) did succeed into that dignity. Where the metropoles were fixed, all the bishops of the province did convene, and with the consent of the clergy, persons of quality, and the commonalty, did elect him.† So was St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, elected. So Nectarius of Constantinople, Flavianus of Antioch, and Cyril of Jerusalem, as the Fathers of Constantinople tell us. So Stephanus and Bassianus, rival bishops of Ephesus, did pretend to have been chosen, as we saw before.

And for confirmation, there did not need any, there is no mention of any; except that confirmation of which we spake, a consequent approbation of them from all their fellow bishops, as having no exception against them, rendering them unworthy of communion. In the synod of Chalcedon it was defined that the bishop of Constantinople should have equal privileges with the bishop of Rome; yet it is expressly cautioned there that he shall not meddle in ordination of bishops in any province, that being left to the metropolitan: for a good time, even in the western parts, the Pope did not meddle with the constitution of metropolitans;‡ leaving the churches to enjoy their liberties. Afterwards, with all other rights, he snatched the collation, confirmation, &c. of metropolitans.§

VII. Sovereigns have a power to censure and correct all inferior magistrates in proportion to their offences; and in case of great misdemeanor, or of incapacity, they can wholly discharge and remove them from their office.

* Syn. VI. Act. xii. 198. P. Honor. ib. p. 198.
† P. Leo. Ep. 88. ‡ Act. xvi. p. 464.
§ Vid. Concil. Aur. can. 7. Apud de Marc. VI. iv. sect. 8.

This prerogative therefore he of Rome doth claim, as most proper to himself, by divine sanction.*

"God Almighty alone can dissolve the spiritual marriage between a bishop and his church." "Therefore those three things premised (the confirmation, translation, and deposition of bishops) are reserved to the Roman bishop, not so much by canonical constitution as by divine institution."†

This power the Convention of Trent doth allow him; thwarting the ancient laws, and betraying the liberties of the Church thereby, and endangering the Christian doctrine to be inflected and corrupted to the advantage of papal interest.‡

But such a power anciently did not by any rule or custom in a peculiar manner belong to the Roman bishop.§

Premising what was generally touched about jurisdiction; in reference to this branch we remark,

1. The exercising of judgment and censure on bishops (when it was needful for general good) was prescribed to be done by synods; provincial or patriarchal, (diocesan.) In them causes were to be discussed, and sentence pronounced against those who had deviated from faith, or committed misdemeanors. So it was appointed in the synod of Nice; as the African synod (wherein St. Austin was one bishop) did observe, and urge in their epistle to Pope Celestine, in those notable words; "Whether they be clergy of an inferior degree, or whether they be bishops, the Nicene decrees have most plainly committed them to the metropolitan's charge: for they have most prudently and justly discerned that all matters whatsoever ought to be determined in the places where they do first begin; and that the grace of the Holy Spirit would not be wanting to every particular province."‖ The same law was enacted by the synod of Antioch, by the synods of Constantinople, Chalcedon, &c.

Thus was Paulus Samosatenus for his error against the divinity of our Lord, and for his scandalous demeanor, deposed by the synod of Antioch.¶ Thus was Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, (being accused of Sabellianism and of other faults,) removed by a synod of the same place; the which sentence he quietly did bear.** Thus another Eustathius, bishop of Sebastia, (for his uncouth garb, and fond conceits against mar-

* Vid. Gelas. Ep. xiii. (p. 640.)
† P. Innoc. III. in Gregor. Decret. lib. i. tit. 7. cap. 2.
‡ Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiv. cap. 5. § Const. Ap. viii. 28.
‖ Syn. Afr. Ep. ad P. Celest. I.
¶ (An. 269.) Euseb. vii. 30.
** Soz. ii. 9.

riage,) was discarded by the synod of Gangra. Thus did a synod of Constantinople abdicate Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, for heterodoxy in the point concerning our Lord's divinity. For the like cause was Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, deposed by a synod there, "gathered by the emperor's command." So was Athanasius tried and condemned (although unjustly as to the matter and cause) by the synod of Tyre. So was St. Chrysostom (although most injuriously) deposed by a synod at Constantinople. So the bishops at Antioch (according to the emperor's order) deposed Stephanus, bishop of that place, for a wicked contrivance against the fame of Euphratas and Vincentius.

In all these condemnations, censures, and depositions of bishops, (whereof each was of high rank and great interest in the Church,) the bishop of Rome had no hand, nor so much as a little finger. All the proceedings did go on supposition of the rule and laws, that such judgments were to be passed by synods.

St. Chrysostom δεκαπέντε ἐπισκόπους καθεῖλεν—deposed fifteen bishops.*

2. In some case a kind of deposing of bishops was assumed by particular bishops, as defenders of the faith, and executors of canons; their deposition consisting in not allowing those to be bishops, whom for erroneous doctrine, or disorderly behavior, (notoriously incurred,) they deemed incapable of the office, presuming their places, *ipso facto*, void.†

This Pope Gelasius I. proposed for a rule, "that not only a metropolitan, but every other bishop, hath a right to separate any persons or any place from the catholic communion, according to the rule by which his heresy is already condemned."‡ And on this account did the Popes for so long time quarrel with the see of Constantinople, because they did not expunge Acacius from the roll of bishops, who had communicated with heretics.§ So did St. Cyprian reject Marcianus, bishop of Arles, for adhering to the Novatians.‖ So Athanasius was said to have deposed Arian bishops, and substituted others in their places.¶ So Acacius and his complices deposed Macedonius and divers other bishops. And the bishops of those times καθεῖλον ἀλλήλους, factiously applying a rule taken for granted then, "deposed one another;"** so Maximus,

* Act. xi Syn. Chalc. p. 411.
† P. Celest. in Nest. Sent. Eph. Act. p. 195. ‡ Ep. 4.
§ Conc. sub Men. (p. 10) ‖ Cypr. Ep. 67.
¶ Soz. iii. 21. ** Socr. ii. 24.

bishop of Jerusalem, deposed Athanasius. So Eusebius* of Nicomedia threatened to depose Alexander of Constantinople, if he would not admit Arius to communion. Acacius and his complices did extrude Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem. He also deposed and expelled Cyril of Jerusalem: and deposed many other bishops at Constantinople. Cyril deposed Nestorius, and Nestorius deposed Cyril and Memnon.† Cyril and Juvenalis deposed John of Antioch. John of Antioch, with his bishops, deposed Cyril and Memnon.‡ Yet after the synod of Ephesus, John of Antioch, "gathering together many bishops, did depose Cyril."§ Stephanus, concerning Bassianus; "Because he had entered into the Church with swords—therefore he was expelled out of it again by the holy Fathers, both by Leo of Rome, the imperial city, and by Flavianus; by the bishop of Alexandria, and also by the bishop of Antioch."|| Anatolius of Constantinople did reject Timotheus of Alexandria. Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, did reject Petrus Fullo.

3. St. Cyprian doth assert the power of censuring bishops, on needful and just occasion, to belong to all bishops, for maintenance of common faith, discipline, and peace.

"Therefore," (saith he, writing to Pope Stephanus himself,) "dear brother, the body of bishops is copious, being coupled by the glue of concord, and the band of unity, that if any of our college shall attempt to frame a heresy, or to tear and spoil the flock of Christ, the rest may succor, and like useful and merciful shepherds may gather together the sheep of our Lord into the flock."¶

The like doctrine is that of Pope Celestine I. in his epistle to the Ephesine synod.**

In matter of faith any bishop might interpose judgment; Theophilus did proceed to condemn the Origenists without regard to the Pope.††

Epiphanius did demand satisfaction of John of Jerusalem.

4. This common right of bishops in some cases is confirmed by the nature of such censures, which consisted in disclaiming persons notoriously guilty of heresy, schism, or scandal; and in refusing to entertain communion with them; which every

* Socr. i. 37. † Id. vii. 34.
‡ Act. Syn. Eph. p. 380.
§ Socr. vii. 34. || Syn. Chalc. Act. xi. p. 405.
¶ Cypr. Ep. 67. (ad Steph.) ** Conc. Eph. Act. ii. p. 324.
†† Vid. Hier. 67 et 78.

bishop, as entitled to the common interests of faith and peace, might do.*

5. Indeed in such a case every Christian had a right (yea an obligation) to desert his own bishop.† So John of Jerusalem having given suspicion of error in faith, St. Epiphanius did write letters to the monks of Palestine not to "communicate with him, till they were satisfied of his orthodoxy."‡ On which account St. Jerome living in Palestine did decline communication with the patriarch thereof; asking him, if it "were any where said to him, or commanded, that without satisfaction concerning his faith, they were bound to maintain communion with him."§ So every bishop, yea every Christian, hath a kind of universal jurisdiction.

6. If any Pope did assume more than was allowed in this case by the canons, or was common to other bishops of his rank, it was an irregularity and an usurpation. Nor would examples, if any were producible, serve to justify him, or to ground a right thereto, any more than the extravagant proceedings of other pragmatical and factious bishops, in the same kind, (whereof so many instances can be alleged,) can assert such a power to any bishop.‖

7. When the Pope hath attempted in this kind, his power hath been disavowed, as an illegal, upstart pretence.¶

8. Other bishops have taken on them, when they apprehended cause, to discard and depose Popes. So did the oriental faction at Sardica depose Pope Julius for transgressing, as they supposed, the laws of the Church, in fostering heretics and criminal persons condemned by synods.** So did the synod of Antioch threaten deposition to the same Pope. So did the patriarch Dioscorus make show to reject Pope Leo from communion. So did St. Hilary anathematise Pope Liberius.

9. Popes, when there was great occasion, and they had a great mind to exert their utmost power, have not yet presumed by themselves, "without joint authority of synods," to condemn bishops.†† So Pope Julius did not presume to depose Eusebius of Nicomedia, his great adversary, and so much obnoxious by his patronising Arianism. Pope Innocent did not

* Cypr. Ep. 67. Thalass. in Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p. 191. P. Agapet. ad Petr. Hier. (p. 24.)

† Menas. (tom. iv. p. 10.)

‡ Hier. Ep. 61. (ad Pammach.) cap. 15. § Ibid. 16.

‖ Theophilus, John of Antioch, Dioscorus.

¶ Vid. de Conc. Sard. ** Soz. iii. 11.

†† P. Gelas. I. Ep. 13.

censure Theophilus and his complices, who so irregularly and wrongfully had extruded St. Chrysostom, although much displeased with them; but endeavored to get a general synod to do the business. Pope Leo I. (though a man of spirit and animosity sufficient) would not, without assistance of a synod, attempt to judge Dioscorus, who had so highly provoked him, and given so much advantage against him, by favoring Eutyches, and persecuting the orthodox.

Indeed often we may presume that Popes would have deposed bishops, if they had thought it regular, or if others commonly had received that opinion, so that they could have expected success in their attempting it. But they many times were angry when their horns were short, and showed their teeth when they could not bite.

10. What has been done in this kind by Popes jointly with others, or in synods, (especially on advantage, when the cause was just and plausible,) is not to be ascribed to the authority of Popes as such. It might be done with their influence, not by their authority: so the synod of Sardica (not Pope Julius) cashiered the enemies of Athanasius;* so the synod of Chalcedon (not Pope Leo) deposed Dioscorus; so the Roman synod (not Pope Celestine) checked Nestorius; and that of Ephesus deposed him. The whole western synod (whereof he was president) had a great sway.

11. If instances were arguments of right, there would be other pretenders to the deposing power. Particular bishops would have it, as we before showed.

12. The people would have the power; for they have sometimes deposed Popes themselves, with effect.

So of Pope Constantine Platina telleth us, "at length he is deposed by the people of Rome, being very much provoked by the indignity of the matter."†

13. There are many instances of bishops being removed or deposed by the imperial authority. This power was indeed necessarily annexed to the imperial dignity; for all bishops being subjects of the emperor, he could dispose of their persons, so as not to suffer them to continue in a place, or to put them from it, as they demeaned themselves, to his satisfaction or otherwise, in reference to public utility. It is reasonable, if they were disloyal or disobedient to him, that he should not suffer them to be in places of such influence, whereby they

* Cyril. ad Joh. Ant. Conc. Eph.—p. 197. 332. Syn. p. 11. 60. Const. Sacr. in Syn. VI. p. 11. Act. Eph. p 332.

† Plat. p. 223. P. Leo VIII. p. 291. Anastasius. Plat. p. 131.

might pervert the people to disaffection. It is fit that he should deprive them of temporalties.

The example of Solomon deposing Abiathar.

Constantine M. "commanded Eusebius and Theogonius to depart out of the cities over which they presided as bishops.*

Constantius deposed Paulus of Constantinople.†

Constantius ejected all that would not subscribe to the Creed of Ariminum.‡

The Emperor Leo deposed Timotheus Ælurus, for which Pope Leo did highly commend and thank him.§

The Emperors discarded divers Popes.

Constantius banished Pope Liberius, and caused another to be put in his room.

Otho put out John the Twelfth.

Justinian deposed Pope Silverius, and banished Pope Vigilius.

Justinian banished Anastasius, bishop of Antioch; extruded Anthimus of Constantinople, and Theodosius of Alexandria.

Neither indeed was any great patriarch effectually deposed without their power or leave.

Flavianus was supported by Theodosius against the Pope.

Dioscorus subsisted by the power of Theodosius Junior.

The deposition of Dioscorus, in the synod of Chalcedon, was voted with a reserve of, "If it shall please our most sacred and pious Lord."‖

In effect the emperors deposed all bishops which were ordained beside their general laws: as Justinian having prescribed conditions and qualifications concerning the ordinations of bishops, subjoineth, "But if any bishop be ordained without using our forementioned constitution, we command you that by all means he be removed from his bishopric."¶

14. The instances alleged to prove the Pope's authority in this case are inconcludent and invalid.

They allege the case of Marcianus, bishop of Arles; concerning whom (for abetting Novatianism) St. Cyprian doth exhort Pope Stephanus, that he would direct letters to the bishops of Gaul and the people of Arles, that he being for his schismatical behavior removed from communion, another should be substituted in his room.**

The epistle, grounding this argument, is questioned by a

* Soz. i. 21. Theodor. i. 20. † Socr. ii. 7. ‡ Id. ii. 37.
§ Evag. ii. 11. Lib. cap 15. P. Leo I. Epist. 99.
‖ Act. ii. p. 202. ¶ Justin. Novell. cxxiii. cap. 1.
** Cypr. Ep. 67.

great critic; but I willingly admit it to be genuine, seeing it hath the style and spirit of St. Cyprian, and suiteth his age, and I see no cause why it should be forged; wherefore, omitting that defence, I answer, that the whole matter being seriously weighed, doth make rather against the Pope's cause than for it; for if the Pope had the sole or sovereign authority of rejecting bishops, why did the Gaulish bishops refer the matter to St. Cyprian? why had Marcianus himself a recourse to him?

St. Cyprian doth not ascribe to the Pope any peculiar authority of judgment or censure, but a common one, which himself could exercise, which all bishops might exercise; "It is," saith he, "our part to provide and succor in such a case; for therefore is the body of priests so numerous, that—by joint endeavor they may suppress heresies and schisms."

The case being such, St. Cyprian earnestly doth move Pope Stephanus to concur in exercise of discipline on that schismatic, and to prosecute effectually the business by his letters; persuading his fellow-bishops in France, "that they would not suffer Marcianus to insult over the college of bishops;" (for to them it seemeth the transaction did immediately belong.)

To do thus St. Cyprian implieth and prescribeth to be the Pope's special duty, not only out of regard to the common interest, but for his particular concernment in the case; that schism having been first advanced against his predecessors.

St. Cyprian also (if we mark it) covertly doth tax the Pope of negligence, in not having soon enough joined with himself and the community of bishops in censuring that delinquent.

We may add that the church of Arles and Gaul, being near Italy, the Pope may be allowed to have some greater sway there, than otherwhere in more distant places; so that St. Cyprian thought his letters to quicken discipline there, might be proper and particularly effectual.

These things being duly considered, what advantage can they draw from this instance? doth it not rather prejudice their cause, and afford a considerable objection against it?

We may observe that the strength of their argumentation mainly consisteth in the words *quibus abstento;* the which (as the drift of the whole epistle and parallel expressions therein do show) do signify no more than *quibus efficiatur ut abstento*, which may procure him to be excommunicated; not *quæ contineant abstentionem*, which contain excommunication, as P. de Marca glosseth: although admitting that sense, it would not import much, seeing only thereby the Pope would have signified his consent with other bishops: wherefore de Marca hath

no great cause to blame us, that we do "not deprehend any magnificent thing in this place for the dignity of the papal see:" indeed he hath, I must confess, better eyes than I, who can see any such mighty things there for that purpose.

As for the substitution of another in the room of Marcianus, that was a consequent of the excommunication; and was to be the work of the clergy and people of the place; for when by common judgment of Catholic bishops any bishop was rejected, the people did apply themselves to choose another.

I adjoin the resolution of a very learned writer of their communion, in these words:

"In this case of Marcianus, bishop of Arles, if the right of excommunication did belong solely to the bishop of Rome, wherefore did Faustinus, bishop of Lyons, advertise Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who was so far distant, concerning those very things touching Marcianus, which both Faustinus himself, and other bishops of the same province, had before sent word of to Stephen, bishop of Rome, who lived nearest, being moreover of all bishops the chief? It must either be said that this was done because of Stephen's negligence; or, what is more probable, according to the discipline then used in the church, that all bishops of neighboring places, but especially those presiding over the most eminent cities, should join their counsels for the welfare of the church, and that Christian religion might not receive the least damage in any of its affairs whatsoever: hence it was, that in the case of Marcianus, bishop of Arles, the bishop of Lyons writ letters to the bishop of Rome and Carthage; and again, that the bishop of Carthage, as being most remote, did write to the bishop of Rome, as being his brother and colleague, who by reason of his propinquity might more easily know and judge of the whole matter."*

The other instances are of a later date, (after the synod of Nice,) and therefore of not so great weight; yea, their having none more ancient to produce, doth strongly make against the antiquity of this right; it being strange that no memory should be of any deposed thereby for above three hundred years: but however such as they are, they do not reach home to the purpose.

They allege Flavianus, bishop of Antioch, deposed by Pope Damasus, as they affirm. But it is wonderful they should have the face to mention that instance; the story in short being this: The great Flavianus,† (a most worthy and orthodox prelate, whom St. Chrysostom in his Statuary Orations doth

* Rigalt. in Cypr. Ep. 67. † Theod.

so highly commend and celebrate) being substituted in the place of 'Meletius by the quire of bishops,'* a party did adhere to Paulinus; and after his decease they set up Evagrius, ordaining him (as Theodoret, who was best acquainted with passages on that side of Christendom, reporteth) against many canons of the Church.

Yet with this party, the Roman bishops, "not willing to know any of these things,"† (three of them in order, Damasus, Siricius, Anastasius,) did conspire, instigating the emperor against Flavianus, and reproaching him as "supporter of a tyrant against the laws of Christ."

But the emperor having called Flavianus to him, and received much satisfaction in his demeanor and discourse, did remand and settle him in his place; "The emperor," saith Theodoret, "wondering at his courage and his wisdom, did command him to return home, and to feed the church committed to him:"‡ at which proceeding when the Romans afterward did grumble, the emperor gave them such reasons and advices, that they complied, and did entertain communion with Flavianus.

It is true that on their suggestions and clamors the emperor was moved at first to order that Flavianus should go to Rome, and give the western bishops satisfaction: but after that he understood the quality of his plea, he freed him of that trouble, and without their allowance settled him in his see.

Here is nothing of the Pope's deposing Flavianus; but of his embracing in a schism the side of a competitor, it being in such a case needful that the Pope or any other bishop should choose with whom he must communicate, and consequently must disclaim the other; in which choice the Pope had no good success; not deposing Flavianus, but vainly opposing him; wherefore this allegation is strangely impertinent, and well may be turned against them.

Indeed in this instance we may see how fallible that see was in their judgment of things, how rash in taking parties and fomenting discords, how pertinacious in a bad cause, how peevish against the common sense of their brethren; (especially considering that before this opposition of Flavianus the Fathers of Constantinople had, in their letter to Pope Damasus and the occidental bishops, approved and commended him to them; highly asserting the legitimateness of his ordination;) in fine, how little their authority did avail with wise and considerate persons, such as Theodosius M. was.§

* Theod. v. 23. † Theod. ib. ‡ Theod. ib.
§ Theod. v. 9.

De Marca* representeth the matter somewhat otherwise out of Socrates: but take the matter as Socrates hath it, and it signifieth no more than that both Theophilus and Damasus would not entertain communion with Flavianus, as being uncapable of the episcopal order, for having violated his oath, and caused a division in the church of Antioch: what is this to judicial deposition? and how did Damasus more depose him than Theophilus, who on the same dissatisfaction did in like manner forbear communion? whenas indeed a wiser and better man than either of them, St. Chrysostom, did hold communion with him, and did at length (saith Socrates, not agreeing with Theodoret) reconcile him to them both.

They allege the deposition of Nestorius. But who knoweth not that he was for heretical doctrine deposed in and by a general synod? Pope Celestine did indeed threaten to withdraw his communion, if he did not renounce his error.† But had not any other bishop sufficient authority to desert a perverter of the faith? Did not his own clergy do the same, being commended by Pope Celestine for it?‡ Did not Cyril in writing to Pope Celestine himself affirm that he might before have declared that he could not communicate with him?§ Did Nestorius admit the Pope's judgment? No, as the papal legates did complain, "he did not admit the constitution of the apostolical chair."|| Did the Pope's sentence obtain effect? No, not any; for, notwithstanding his threats, Nestorius did hold his place till the synod; the emperor did severely rebuke Cyril for his fierceness, (and implicitly the Pope,) and did order that no change should be made, till the synod should determine in the case; not regarding the Pope's judgment: so that this instance may well be retorted, or used to prove the insignificancy of papal authority then.

They allege also Dioscorus of Alexandria deposed by Pope Leo: but the case is very like to that of Nestorius, and argueth the contrary to what they intend: he was for his misdemeanors, and violent countenancing of heresy, solemnly in a general synod accused, tried, condemned, and deposed; the which had long before been done, if in the Pope, his professed and provoked adversary, there had been sufficient power to effect it.

* Socr. v. 15. Marc. iii. 14 sect. 1.

† P. Celest. ad Cyril. in Conc. Eph. Act. p. 281. Ibid. Epist. ad Nest. p. 186.

‡ P. Celest. ad Clerum, &c. Const. Act. Eph. p. 190.

Cyril. Ep. ad Celest. Act. Eph. p. 177.

§||Conc. Eph. Act. iii. p. 331.

Bellarmine also allegeth Pope Sixtus III. deposing Polycronius, bishop of Jerusalem: but no such Polycronius is to be found in the registers of bishops then, or in the histories of that busy time, between the two great synods of Ephesus and Chalcedon; and the Acts of Sixtus, on which this allegation is grounded, have so many inconsistencies, and smell so rank of forgery, that no conscionable nose could endure them; and any prudent man, as Binius himself confesseth, "would assert them to be spurious." Wherefore Baronius himself doth reject and despise them; who gladly would lose no advantage for his master. Yet Pope Nicholas I. doth precede Bellarmine in citing this trash; no wonder, that being the Pope who did avouch the wares of Isidore Mercator.*

They allege Timotheus, the usurper of Alexandria, deposed by Pope Damasus;† and they have indeed the sound of words attesting to them; "These are heads on which the B. Damasus deposed the heretics Apolinarius, Vitalius, and Timotheus."‡

The truth is, that Apolinarius, with divers of his disciples, in a great synod at Rome, at which Petrus, bishop of Alexandria, together with Damasus, was present, was condemned and disavowed for heretical doctrine; whence Sozomen saith, that "the Apolinarian heresy was by Damasus and Peter, at a synod in Rome, voted to be excluded from the Catholic Church."§

On which account if we conclude that the Pope had an authority to depose bishops, we may by like reason infer that every patriarch and metropolitan had a power to do the like; there being so many instances of their having condemned and disclaimed bishops supposedly guilty of heresy; as particularly John of Antioch, with his convention of oriental bishops, did pretend to depose Cyril and Memnon, as guilty of the same Apolinarian heresy; alleging that to "exscind them was the same thing as to settle orthodoxy."|| The which deposition was at first admitted by the Emperor.

The next instance is of Pope Agapetus¶ (in Justinian's time, for so deep into time is Bellarmine fain to dive for it) deposing Anthimus, bishop of Constantinople. But this instance being scanned will also prove slender and lame. The case was this: Anthimus having deserted his charge at Trabisonde did creep into the see of Constantinople, (a course then held irregular

* Baron. ann. 433. sect. 38. 39. P. Nich. I. Epist. 8. (ad Mich.)
† Fac. Herm p 150.
‡ Orient. ad Rufum, apud Bin. p. 396. § Soz. vi. 25.
|| Relat. Orient ad Imp. in Act. Eph. p. 380. Act. p. 385.
¶ Ann. 536. Vict. Tun.

and repugnant to the canons,) and withal he had imbibed the Eutychian heresy. Yet for his support he had wound himself into the favor of the Empress Theodora, a countenancer of the Eutychian sect.* Things standing thus, Pope Agapetus (as an agent from Rome to crave succor against the Goths, pressing and menacing the city) did arrive at Constantinople. Whereon the empress desired of him to salute and consort with Anthimus.† But he, by petitions of the monks, &c. understanding how things stood, did refuse to do so, except Anthimus "would return to his own charge, and profess the orthodox doctrine." Thereon the emperor joined with him to extrude Anthimus from Constantinople, and to substitute Menas. "He," say the monks in their libel of request to the emperor, "did justly thrust this Anthimus from the episcopal chair of this city; your grace affording aid and force both to the Catholic faith and the divine canons."‡ The act of Agapetus was (according to his share in the common interest) to declare Anthimus, in his judgment, uncapable of catholic communion and of episcopal function by reason of his heretical opinions, and his transgression of ecclesiastical orders;§ which moved Justinian effectually to depose and extrude him; "You," say they, "fulfilling that which he justly and canonically did judge, and by your general edict confirming it; and forbidding that hereafter such things should be attempted.—" And Agapetus himself saith, that it was done by "the apostolical authority, and the assistance of the most faithful emperors."‖ The which proceeding was completed by decree of the synod under Menas, and that again was confirmed by the imperial sanction. Whence Evagrius, reporting the story, doth say, concering Anthimus and Theodosius of Alexandria, that "because they did cross the emperor's commands, and did not admit the decrees of Chalcedon, they both were expelled from their sees."¶

It seemeth by some passages in the Acts, that before Agapetus's intermeddling, the monks** and orthodox†† bishops had condemned and rejected Anthimus; according to the common interest, which they assert all Christians to have in regard to the common faith.

As for the substitution of Menas, it was performed "by the choice and suffrage of the emperor, the clergy, nobles, and

* Evag. iv. 10. † Lib. cap. 21. Libell. Monach. p. 7.
‡ Ibid. Et Syn. Decr. p. 43. Imper. Sanct. p. 128.
§ Synod. Dec. p. 43. ‖ P. 24. ¶ Evag. iv. 11.
** P. 10. †† P. 16.

people conspiring;" the Pope only (which another bishop might have done) ordaining or consecrating him; "Then," saith Liberatus, "the Pope by the emperor's favor did ordain Menas bishop, consecrating him with his hand."*

And Agapetus did glory in this, as being the first ordination made of an eastern bishop by the hands of a Pope:† "And this," said the Pope, "we conceive, doth add to his dignity, because the eastern church never since the time of the Apostle Peter did receive any bishop besides him, by the imposition of hands of those who sat in this our chair."‡

If we compare the proceedings of Agapetus against Anthimus, with those of Theophilus against St. Chrysostom; they are (except the cause and qualities of persons) in all main respects and circumstances so like, that the same reason which would ground a pretence of universal jurisdiction to one, would infer the same to the other.

Baronius allegeth Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, deposed by Pope Felix III.§ But Pope Gelasius asserteth that any bishop might, in execution of the canons, have disclaimed Acacius, as a favorer of heretics. And Acacius did not only refuse to submit to the Pope's jurisdiction, but slighted it.‖ And the Pope's act was but an attempt, not effectual; for Acacius died in possession of his see.

VIII. If Popes were sovereigns of the Church, they could effectually, whenever they should see it just and fit, absolve; restore any bishop excommunicated from the Church, or deposed from his office by ecclesiastical censure: for relief of the oppressed, or clemency to the distressed, are noble flowers in every sovereign crown.

Wherefore the Pope doth assume this power, and reserveth it to himself, as his special prerogative; "It is," says Baronius, "a privilege of the church of Rome only, that a bishop deposed by a synod may without another synod of a greater number be restored by the Pope;"¶ and Pope Gelasius I. says, "That the see of St. Peter the Apostle has a right of loosing whatever the sentences of other bishops have bound"**—"That the apostolic see, according to frequent ancient custom, had a power, no synod preceding, to absolve those whom a synod had unjustly condemned, and without a council to condemn those who deserved it."††

* Lib. cap. 21. † Act. p. 24. ‡ Ibid.

§ Baron. ann. 484. sect. 19. Vid. P. Felic. III. Ep. 6. P. Gelas. Ep. 4.

‖ Gelas. Ep. 13. ¶ Baron. ann. 449. sect. 127.

** P. Gelas. I. Ep. 13. †† Ibid.

It was an old pretence of Popes, that bishops were not condemned, except the Pope did consent, renouncing communion with them. So Pope Vigilius saith of St. Chrysostom and Flavianus, that "although they were violently excluded, yet were they not looked on as condemned, because the bishops of Rome always inviolably kept communion with them."*

And before him Pope Gelasius saith, that "the Pope, by not consenting to the condemnation of Athanasius, Chrysostom, Flavianus, did absolve them."†

But such a power of old did not belong to him. For,

1. There is not extant any ancient canon of the Church, nor apparent footsteps of custom, allowing such a power to him.

2. Decrees of synods (provincial in the former times, and diocesan afterwards) were inconsistent with, or repugnant to such a power; for judgments concerning episcopal causes were deemed irrevocable, and appointed to be so by decrees of divers synods; and consequently no power was reserved to the Pope of thwarting them by restitution of any bishop condemned in them.

3. The apostolical canons, (which at least serve to prove or illustrate ancient customs,) and divers synodical decrees, did prohibit entertaining communion with any person condemned or rejected by canonical judgment;‡ without exception, or reservation of power of infringing or relaxing that prohibition; and Pope Gelasius himself says, "That he who had polluted himself by holding communion with a condemned person, did partake of his condemnation."‡

4. Whence in elder times Popes were opposed and checked when they offered to receive bishops rejected in particular synods. So St. Cyprian declared the restitution of Basilides by Pope Stephanus to be null.‖ So the Fathers of the Antiochene synod did reprehend Pope Julius for admitting Athanasius and Marcellus to communion, or avowing them for bishops, after their condemnation by synods. And the oriental bishops of Sardica did excommunicate the same Pope for communicating with the same persons. Which instances do show that the Pope was not then undoubtedly, or according to common opinion, endowed with such a power.

But whereas they do allege some instances of such a power, I shall premise some general considerations apt to clear the business, and then apply answers to the particular allegations.

* P. Vigilius in Constit. Athan. &c. † P. Gelas. Ep. 3.
‡ Can. Apost. 10. 11. 12. 13. Conc. Nic. Can. 5. Sard. 16. 17.
§ P. Gelas. Ep. 13. (p. 640.) ‖ Cypr. Ep. 68.

1. Restitution commonly doth signify no more than acknowleging a person (although rejected by undue sentence) to be *de jure* worthy of communion, and capable of the episcopal office; on which may be consequent an obligation to communicate with him, and to allow him his due character; according to the precept of St. Paul, 'Follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord with a pure heart.'

This may be done, when any man notoriously is persecuted for the truth and righteousness. Or when the iniquity and malice of pretended judges are apparent, to the oppression of innocence. Or when the process is extremely irregular: as in the cases of Athanasius, of St. Chrysostom. And this is not an act of jurisdiction, but of equity and charity, incumbent on all bishops: and there are promiscuous instances of bishops practising it. Thus Socrates saith that Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, "did restore communion and dignity to Athanasius."* And so Cyril of Alexandria, and John of Antioch, being reconciled and reduced to a good understanding of each other, "did restore to each other their sees;" rescinding the censures, which in heat they had denounced each on other. Which showeth that restitution is not always taken for an act of jurisdiction, wherein one is superior to another; for those persons were in rank and power coordinate.

2. Restitution sometime doth import no more than a considerable influence toward the effects of restoring a person to communion or office; no judicial act being exercised about the case; "The emperor writing that Paulus and Athanasius should be restored to their sees, availed nothing—."† That was a restitution without effect.

Thus a Pope's avowing the orthodoxy, or innocence, or worth of a person, after a due information about them, (by reason of the Pope's eminent rank in the Church, and the regard duly had to him,) might sometimes much conduce to restore a person; and might obtain the name of restitution, by an ordinary scheme of speech.

3. Sometimes persons said to be restored by Popes are also said to be restored by synods, with regard to such instance or testimony of Popes in their behalf. In which case the judicial restitution, giving right of recovery and completion thereto, was the act of the synod.‡

* Socr. ii. 24. † Id. ii. 20.

‡ Note. It is an ordinary style of votes in synods for the restitution of a bishop, *I restore.* Vid. Conc. Chalc. Act. i. p. 165. That is, I give my vote for his restitution.

4. When cases were driven to a legal debate, Popes could not effectually resolve without a synod, their single acts not being held sufficiently valid. So notwithstanding the declarations of Pope Julius in favor of Athanasius, for the effectual resolution of his case the great synod of Sardica was convened. So whatever Pope Innocent I. did endeavor, he could not restore St. Chrysostom without a general synod.

Nor could Pope Leo restore Flavianus, deposed in the second Ephesine synod, without convocation of a general synod, the which he did so often sue for to the emperor Theodosius, for that purpose. Pope Simplicius affirmed that Petrus Moggus, "having been by a common decree condemned as an adulterer, (or usurper of the Alexandrian see,) could not without a common council be freed from condemnation."*

5. Particular instances do not ascertain right to the person who assumeth any power; for busybodies often will exceed their bounds.

6. Emperors did sometimes restore bishops. Constantine, as he did banish Eusebius of Nicomedia and others, so he did revoke and restore them; so says Socrates, "They were recalled from banishment by the emperor's command, and received their churches."† Theodosius did assert to Flavianus his right, whereof the Popes did pretend to deprive him;‡ which did amount to a restitution; (at least to the Romanists, who do assert Flavianus to be deposed by the Popes.) Instantius and Priscillianus were by the "rescript of the emperor Gratianus restored to their churches."§ Justinian did order Pope Silverius to be restored, in case he could prove his innocence.

7. Commonly restitution was not effectual without the emperor's consent; whence Theodoret, although allowed by the great synod, did acknowlege his restitution especially due to the emperor; as we shall see in reflecting on his case.

Now to the particular instances produced for the Pope, we answer:

1. They pretend that Pope Stephanus did restore Basilides and Martialis, Spanish bishops, who had been deposed; for which they quote St. Cyprian's epistle, where he says, "Basilides going to Rome imposed on our colleague, Stephen, who lived a great way off, and was ignorant of the truth of the matter; seeking unjustly to be restored to his bishopric, from which he had justly been deposed."||

But we answer; the Pope did attempt such a restitution by

* Lib. cap. 18. † Socr. i. 14. ‡ Theod. v. 23
§ Sulp. Sev. ii. 63. || Cypr. Ep. 68.

way of influence and testimony, not of jurisdiction; wherefore the result of his act in St. Cyprian's judgment was null and blamable; which could not be so deemed if he had acted as a judge; for a favorable sentence, passed by just authority, is valid, and hardly liable to censure.* The clergy of those places, notwithstanding that pretended restitution, did conceive those bishops uncapable; and did request the judgment of St. Cyprian about it; which argueth the Pope's judgment not to have been peremptory and prevalent then in such cases. St. Cyprian denieth the Pope, or any other person, to have power of restoring in such a case: and exhorteth the clergy to persist "in declining the communion of those bishops." Well doth Rigaltius ask, why they should write to St. Cyprian, if the judgment of Stephanus was decisive;† and he addeth, that indeed "the Spaniards did appeal from the Roman bishop to him of Carthage."‡ No wonder, seeing the Pope had no greater authority, and probably St. Cyprian had the fairer reputation for wisdom and goodness. Considering which things, what can they gain by this instance? which indeed doth considerably make against them.

2. They allege the restitution of Athanasius, and of others linked in cause with him, by Pope Julius. "He," says Sozomen, "as having the care of all by reason of the dignity of his see, restored to each his own church."§

I answer, the Pope did not restore them judicially, but declaratively; that is, declaring his approbation of their right and innocence, did admit them to communion.‖ Julius in his own defence did allege that Athanasius was not legally rejected; so that without any prejudice to the canons he might receive him; and the doing it on this account, plainly did not require any act of judgment.

Nay it was necessary to avow those bishops, as suffering in the cause of the common faith. Besides, the Pope's proceeding was taxed and protested against as irregular; nor did he defend it by virtue of a general power that he had judicially to rescind the acts of synods. And, lastly, the restitution of Athanasius and the other bishops had no complete effect, till it was confirmed by the synod of Sardica, backed by the imperial authority; which in effect did restore them. This instance therefore is in many respects deficient as to their purpose.

3. They produce Marcellus being restored by the same Pope Julius.¶

* Cypr. Ep 55. † Rigalt. ibid. ‡ Rigalt.
§ Soz. iii. 8. ‖ Ibid. ¶ Socr. i. 36.

But that instance, beside the forementioned defects, hath this, that the Pope was grievously mistaken in the case; whence St. Basil much blameth him for his proceeding therein.*

4. They cite the restitution of Eustathius (bishop of Sebastia) by Pope Liberius, out of an epistle of St. Basil, where he says, "What the most blessed bishop Liberius proposed to him, and to what he consented, we know not; only that he brought a letter to be restored, and on showing it to the synod at Tyana was restored to his see."†

I answer, that restitution was only from an invalid deposition by a synod of Arians at Melitine;‡ importing only an acknowlegement of him, on approbation of his faith professed by him at Rome; the which had such influence to the satisfaction of the Diocesan synod at Tyana, that he was restored. Although indeed the Romans were abused by him, he not being sound in faith; for "he now," saith St. Basil, "doth destroy that faith for which he was received——."§

5. They adjoin that Theodoret was restored by Pope Leo I. for in the acts of the synod of Chalcedon it is said that "he did receive his place from the bishop of Rome."‖

I answer, the act of Leo did consist in an approbation of the faith, which Theodoret did profess to hold; and a reception of him to communion thereon; which he might well do, seeing the ground of Theodoret's being disclaimed was a misprision,¶ that he (having opposed Cyril's writings, judged orthodox) did err in faith, consenting with Nestorius.

Theodoret's state before the second Ephesine synod is thus represented in the words of the emperor; "Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, whom we have before commanded to mind only his own church, we charge not to come to the holy synod, before the whole synod being met, it shall seem good to them that he come and bear his part in it."**

He was not perfectly deposed; as others were, who had others substituted in their places. He was deposed by the Ephesine synod.††

The Pope was indeed ready enough to assume the patronage of so very learned and worthy a man, who in so very suppliant and respectful a way had addressed to him for succor; for whom doth not courtship mollify? And the majority of the

* Bas. Ep. 10. † Ibid. 74. ‡ Soz. iv. 24.
§ Bas. Ep. 74. ‖ Act. i. p. 53.
¶ Syn. Chalc. Act. viii. p. 368.
** Imp. Theod. Epist. ad Diosc. in Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p. 53.
†† Liberat. 12. Vid. Conc. Chalc. part. iii. p. 490. Theod. rescript.

synod (being inflamed against Dioscorus and the Eutychian party) was ready enough to allow what the Pope did in favor of him. Yet a good part of the synod (the bishops of Egypt, of Palestine, of Illyricum,) notwithstanding the Pope's restitution, (that is, his approbation in order thereto,) did stickle against his admission into the synod; "Crying out, Have pity on us, the faith is destroyed, the canons proscribe this man, cast him out, cast out Nestorius's master."* So that the imperial agents were fain to compromise the business, permitting him to sit in the synod, as one whose case was dependent, but not in the notion of one absolutely restored. "Theodoret's presence shall prejudice no man, each one's right of impleading being reserved both to you and him."†

He therefore was not intirely restored, till on a clear and satisfactory profession of his faith he was acquitted by the judgment of the synod. The effectual restitution of him proceeded from the emperor, who repealed the proceedings against him; as himself doth acknowlege; "All these things," says he, "has the most just emperor evacuated"‡——"to these things he premised the redressing my injuries;"§ and the imperial judges in the synod of Chalcedon join the emperor in the restitution.—"Let the most reverend Theodoret enter, and bear his part in the synod; since the most holy Archbishop Leo and sacred emperor have restored his bishopric to him."‖ Hence it may appear that the Pope's restitution of Theodoretus was only opinionative, dough-baked, incomplete; so that it is but a slim advantage, which their pretence can receive from it.

IX. It belongeth to sovereigns to receive appeals from all lower judicatures, for the final determination of causes; so that no part of his subjects can obstruct resort to him, or prohibit his revision of any judgment.

This power therefore the Pope doth most stiffly assert to himself. At the synod of Florence, this was the first and great branch of authority, which he did demand of the Greeks explicitly to avow: "He will (said his three cardinals to the emperor) have all the privileges of his church, and that appeals be made to him."¶ When Pope Alexander III. was advised not to receive an appeal in Becket's case, he replied in that profane allusion; "This is my glory, which I will not give to another." He hath been wont to encourage all people, even on the slightest occasions, *iter arripere*, (as the phrase is

* Id. p. 54. † Ibid.
‡ Id. Ep. 139. (ad Asperam.) § Ep. 138. (ad Anatol.)
‖ Act. i. p. 53. ¶ Syn. Flor. Sess. xxv. p. 846.

obvious in their canon law,) to run with all haste to his audience; "Concerning appeals for the smallest causes we would have you hold that the same deference is to be given them for how slight a matter soever they be made, as if they were for a greater."* See, if you please, in Gratian's Decree, Caus. ii. quæst. 6. where many papal decrees (most indeed drawn out of the spurious epistles of ancient Popes, but ratified by their successors, and obtaining for current law) are made for appeals to the see of Rome.

It was indeed one of the most ancient encroachments, and that which did serve most to introduce the rest; inferring hence a title to an universal jurisdiction: "They are the canons," says Pope Nicholas I. "which will that all appeals of the whole Church be brought to the examination of this see, and have decreed that no appeal be made from it, and that thus she judge of the whole Church; but herself goes to be judged by none other:"† and the same Pope, in another of his epistles, says, "The holy statutes and venerable decrees have committed the causes of bishops, as being weighty matters, to be determined by us.——."‡ "As the synod has appointed and usage requires, let greater and difficult cases be always referred to the apostolic see,"§ says Pope Pelagius II. "They are the canons which will have the appeals of the whole Church tried by this see,"‖ saith Pope Gelasius I.

But this power is on various accounts unreasonable, grievous, and vexatious to the Church; as hath been deemed, and on divers occasions declared, by the ancient Fathers, and grave persons in all times; on accounts not only blaming the horrible abuse of appeals, but implying the great mischiefs inseparably adherent to them.

The synod of Basil thus excellently declared concerning them: "Hitherto many abuses of intolerable vexations have prevailed, whilst many have too often been called and cited from the most remote parts to the court of Rome, and that sometime for small and trifling matters, and with charges and trouble to be so wearied, that they sometime think it their best way to recede from their right, or buy off their trouble with great loss, rather than be at the cost of suing in so remote a country."¶

* Alex. III. Ep. ad Vigorn. Episc. in Decret. Greg. lib. ii. tit. 28. cap. 11.

† P. Nich. I. Ep. 8. ‡ Ibid. 38.

§ P. Pelag. II. Epist. 8. ‖ P. Gelas. I. Ep. 4.

¶ Concil. Basil. Sess. xxxi. (p. 86.) Vid. Opt.

St. Bernard complaineth of the mischiefs of appeals in his times, in these words: "How long will you be deaf to the complaints of the whole world, or make as if you were so? Why sleep you? When will the consideration of so great confusion and abuse in appeals awake in you? They are made without right or equity, without due order, and against custom. Neither place, nor manner, nor time, nor cause, nor person, are considered: they are everywhere made lightly, and for the most part unjustly:" with much more passionate language to the same purpose.

But in the primitive Church the Pope had no such power.

1. Whereas in the first times many causes and differences did arise, wherein they who were condemned and worsted would readily have resorted thither, where they might have hoped for remedy, if Rome had been such a place of refuge, it would have been very famous for it; and we should find history full of such examples; whereas it is very silent about them.

2. The most ancient customs and canons of the Church are flatly repugnant to such a power; for they did order causes finally to be decided in each province.

So the synod of Nice did decree; as the African Fathers did allege, in defence of their refusal to allow appeals to the Pope: "The Nicene decrees," said they, "most evidently did commit both clergymen of inferior degrees and bishops to their metropolitans."*

So Theophilus in his epistle; "I suppose you are not ignorant what the canons of the Nicene council command, ordaining that a bishop should judge no cause out of his own district."†

3. Afterward, when the diocesan administration was introduced, the last resort was decreed to the synods of them, (or to the primates in them,) all other appeals being prohibited; "as dishonorable to the bishops of the diocese; reproaching the canons, and subverting ecclesiastical order:"‡ to which canon the emperor Justinian referred; "For it is decreed by our ancestors, that against the sentence of these prelates there should be no appeal."§ So Constantius told Pope Liberius; "that those things which had a form of judgment passed on them

* Syn. Afr. in Ep. ad P. Celest. † Pallad. cap. 7.

‡ Note, that the synod of Constantinople, (Can. 6.) mentioning appeals to the emperor, secular judicatories, a general synod, saith, Ἀτιμάσας τοὺς τῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπους, &c. Syn. Const. Can. 6. Concil. Constantinop. Can. 2. 6. Concil. Chalced. Can. 9. 17.

§ Cod. lib. i. tit. 4. cap. 29.

could not be rescinded."* This was the practice (at least in the eastern parts of the Church) in the time of Justinian; as is evident by the Constitutions extant in the Code and in the Novels.†

4. In derogation to this pretence, divers provincial synods expressly did prohibit all appeals from their decisions.‡

That of Milevis; "Let them appeal only to African councils or the primates of provinces; and he who shall think of appealing beyond sea, let him be admitted into communion by none in Afric."§

"For if the Nicene council took this care of the inferior clergy, how much more did they intend it should relate to bishops also?"‖

5. All persons were forbidden to entertain communion with bishops condemned by any one church; which is inconsistent with their being allowed relief at Rome.

6. This is evident in the case of Marcion, by the assertion of the Roman church at that time.

7. When the Pope hath offered to receive appeals, or to meddle in cases before decided, he hath found opposition and reproof. Thus when Felicissimus and Fortunatus, having been censured and rejected from communion in Afric, did apply themselves to Pope Cornelius, with supplication to be admitted by him; St. Cyprian maintaineth that fact to be irregular and unjust, and not to be countenanced, for divers reasons.¶ Likewise when Basilides and Martialis, being for their crimes deposed in Spain, had recourse to Pope Stephanus for restitution, the clergy and people there had no regard to the judgment of the Pope; the which their resolution St. Cyprian did commend and encourage.

When Athanasius, Marcellus, Paulus, &c. having been condemned by synods, did apply themselves for relief to Pope Julius; the oriental bishops did highly tax this course as irregular; disclaiming any power in him to receive them, or meddle in their cause. Nor could Pope Julius by any law or instance disprove their plea; nor did the Pope assert to himself any peculiar authority to revise the cause, or otherwise justify his proceeding, than by right common to all bishops of vindicating right and innocence, which were oppressed; and of asserting the faith, for which they were persecuted. Indeed at

* Theod. xi. 16.
† Nov. cxxiii. cap. 22. Cod. Lib. i. tit. 4. sect. 29. Vid. Græc.
‡ Can. 12. Conc. Ant. Can. 15. Con. Carth. Can. 31.
§ Conc. Milev. cap. 22. Conc. Afr. Can. 72.
‖ Conc. Afr. Can. 105. (vel Epist.) ¶ Cypr. Ep. 68.

first the oriental bishops were contented to refer the cause to Pope Julius as arbitrator; which signifieth that he had no ordinary right; but afterward, either fearing their cause or his prejudice, they started, and stood to the canonicalness of the former decision.

The contest of the African church with Pope Celestine, in the cause of Apiarius, is famous; and the reasons which they assign for repelling that appeal are very notable and peremptory.

8. Divers of the Fathers allege like reasons against appeals. St. Cyprian allegeth these:*

1. Because there was an ecclesiastical law against them.

2. Because they contain iniquity; as prejudicing the right of each bishop granted by Christ, in governing his flock.

3. Because the clergy and people should not be engaged to run gadding about.

4. Because causes might better be decided there, where witnesses of fact might easily be had.

5. Because there is every where a competent authority, equal to any that might be had otherwhere.

6 Because it did derogate from the gravity of bishops to alter their censure—.

7. Pope Liberius desired of Constantius that the judgment of Athanasius might be made in Alexandria for such reasons, "because there the accused, the accusers, and their defender were."†

8. St. Chrysostom's argument against Theophilus meddling in his case may be set against Rome as well as Alexandria.

9. St. Austin, in matter of appeal, or rather of reference to candid arbitration, (more proper for ecclesiastical causes,) doth conjoin other apostolical churches with that of Rome; "For the business," says he, "was not about priests and deacons, or the inferior clergy, but the colleagues, [bishops,] who may reserve their cause intire for the judgment of their colleagues, especially those of the apostolical churches."‡ He would not have said so, if he had apprehended that the Pope had a peculiar right of revising judgments.

10. Pope Damasus (or rather Pope Siricius) doth affirm himself incompetent to judge in a case which had been afore determined by the synod of Capua; "—but," says he, "since the synod of Capua has thus determined it, we perceive we cannot judge it."

* Refer ad sect. 7. Vid. supr. Cypr. Ep. 55.
† Theod. xi. 16. ‡ Aug. Ep. 162.

11. Anciently there were no appeals (properly so called, or jurisdictional) in the Church; they were, as Socrates telleth us, introduced by Cyril of Jerusalem; who "first did appeal to a greater judicature, against ecclesiastical rule and custom."* This is an argument that about that time (a little before the great synod of Constantinople) greater judicatories, or diocesan synods, were established; whenas before provincial synods were the last resorts.

12. On many occasions appeals were not made to the Pope, as in all likelihood they would have been, if it had been supposed that a power of receiving them did belong to him. Paulus Samosatenus did appeal to the emperor. The Donatists did not appeal to the Pope, but to the emperor.† Their cause was by the emperor referred, not to the Pope singly, (as it ought to have been, and would have been by so just a prince, if it had been his right,) but to him and other judges as the emperor's commissioners.‡ Athanasius did first appeal to the emperor. St. Chrysostom did request the Pope's succor, but he did not appeal to him as judge; although he knew him favorably disposed, and the cause sure in his hand; but he appealed to a general council: the which Innocent himself did conceive necessary for decision of that cause.§

[There are in history innumerable instances of bishops being condemned and expelled from their sees, but few of appeals; which is a sign that was no approved remedy in common opinion.]

Eutyches did appeal to all the patriarchs. Theodoret did intend to appeal to all the western bishops.

13. Those very canons of Sardica (the most unhappy that ever were made to the Church) which did introduce appeals to the Pope, do yet on divers accounts prejudice his claim to an original right, and do on no account favor that use of them, to which (to the overthrow of all ecclesiastical liberty and good discipline) they have been perverted. For,

1. They do pretend to confer a privilege on the Pope; which argueth that he before had no claim thereto.

2. They do qualify and restrain that privilege to certain cases and forms; which is a sign that he had no power therein flowing from absolute sovereignty: for it is strange that they who did pretend and intend so much to favor him should clip his power.

3. It is not really a power which they grant of receiving ap-

* Socr. ii. 40. † Aug. Ep. 162. ‡ Ibid.
§ Sozom. viii. 26.

peals in all causes; but a power of constituting judges, qualified according to certain conditions, to revise a special sort of causes concerning the judgment and deposition of bishops. Which considerations do subvert his pretence to original and universal jurisdiction on appeals.

14. Some Popes did challenge jurisdiction on appeals, as given them by the Nicene Canons, meaning thereby those of Sardica; which showeth they had no better plea, and therefore no original right. And otherwhere we shall consider what validity those canons may be allowed to have.

15. The general synod of Chalcedon (of higher authority than that of Sardica) derived appeals, at least in the eastern churches, into another channel; namely, to the primate of each diocese, or to the patriarch of Constantinople.* That this was the last resort doth appear, from that otherwise they would have mentioned the Pope.

16. Appeals in cases of faith or general discipline were indeed sometimes made to the consideration of the Pope; but not only to him, but to all other patriarchs and primates, as concerned in the common maintenance of the common faith or discipline. So did Eutyches appeal to the patriarchs.

17. The Pope, even in later times, even in the western parts, hath found rubs in his trade of appeals. Consider the scuffle between Pope Nicholas I. and Hincmarus, bishop of Rhemes.†

18. Christian states, to prevent the intolerable vexations and mischiefs arising from this practice, have been constrained to make laws against them. Particularly England.

In the twelfth age Pope Paschal II. complained of King Henry I. "that he deprived the oppressed of the benefit of appealing to the apostolic see."‡ It was one of King Henry Ist's laws, "—none is permitted to cry from thence, no judgment is thence brought to the apostolic see."§ "Foreign judgments we utterly remove,"‖ "—there let the cause be tried where the crime was committed."¶ It was one of the grievances sent to Pope Innocent IV. "that Englishmen were drawn out of the kingdom by the Pope's authority, to have their causes heard."**

Nor in after times were appeals by law in any case permitted without the king's leave; although sometimes by the facility of princes, or difficulty of times, the Roman court (ever

* Can. 9. 17. † Baron. ann. 865——. P. Nic. I. Ep. 37. &c.
‡ Eadm. p. 113. § Ibid. ‖ Hen. I. Leg. cap. 31.
¶ Ibid. ** Matt. Paris. p. 699. 10.

importunate and vigilant for its profits) did obtain a relaxation or neglect of laws inhibiting appeals.

19. There were appeals from Popes to general councils very frequently. Vid. The senate of Paris after the concordates between Lewis XI. and Pope Leo X.

20. By many laws and instances it appeareth that appellations have been made to the emperors in the greatest causes; and that without Popes reclaiming or taking it in bad part. St. Paul did appeal to Cæsar. Paulus Samosatenus did appeal to Aurelianus.* So the Donatists did appeal to Constantine. Athanasius to Constantine † The Egyptian bishops to Constantine.‡ Priscillianus to Maximus.§ Idacius to Gracian. So that canons were made to restrain bishops from recourse *ad comitatum.*

21. Whereas they do allege instances for appeal, those well considered do prejudice their cause; for they are few in comparison to the occasions of them, that ever did arise; they are near all of them late, when papal encroachments had grown; some of them are very impertinent to the cause; some of them may strongly be retorted against them; all of them are invalid.

If the Pope originally had such a right, (known, unquestionable, prevalent,) there might have been producible many, ancient, clear, proper, concluding instances.

All that Bellarmine‖ (after his own search, and that of his predecessors in controversy) could muster, are these following; on which we shall briefly reflect: (adding a few others, which may be alleged by them.)

He allegeth Marcion, as appealing to the Pope.¶

The truth was, that Marcion, for having corrupted a maid, was by his own father, bishop of Sinope, driven from the Church;** whereon he did thence fly to Rome, there "begging admittance to communion, but none did grant it:" at which he expostulating, they replied, "We cannot without the permission of thy honorable father do this; for there is one faith, and one concord; and we cannot cross thy father our good fellow-minister." This was the case and issue: and is it not strange this should be produced for an appeal, which was only a supplication of a fugitive criminal to be admitted to communion; and wherein is utterly disclaimed any power to thwart the judgment of a particular bishop or judge, on account of unity in common faith and peace? Should the Pope return

* Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 16. † Apol. ii. p. 804.
‡ Ath. Apol. ii. p. 797. 798. § Sulp. Sev. ii. 64. Id. ii. 63.
‖ Bell. ii. 21. ¶ Ann. 142. ** Epiph. Hær. 42.

the same answer to every appellant, what would become of his privilege? So that they must give us leave to retort this as a pregnant instance against their pretence.

He allegeth the forementioned address of Felicissimus and Fortunatus to Pope Cornelius;* the which was but a factious circumcursation of desperate wretches; the which, or any like it, St. Cyprian argueth the Pope in law and equity obliged not to regard; because a definitive sentence was already passed on them by their proper judges in Afric, from whom in conscience and reason there could be no appeal. So Bellarmine would filch from us one of our invincible arguments against him.

He also allegeth the case of Basilides;† which also we before did show to make against him; his application to the Pope being disavowed by St. Cyprian, and proving ineffectual.

These are all the instances which the first three hundred years did afford; so that all that time this great privilege lay dormant.

He allegeth the recourse of Athanasius to Pope Julius;‡ but this was not properly to him as to a judge, but as to a fellow-bishop, a friend of truth and right, for his succor and countenance against persecutors of him, chiefly for his orthodoxy.§ The Pope did undertake to examine his plea, partly as arbitrator on reference of both parties; partly for his own concern, to satisfy himself whether he might admit him to communion. And having heard and weighed things, the Pope denied that he was condemned in a legal way by competent judges; and that therefore the pretended sentence was null; and consequently he did not undertake the cause as on appeal. But whereas his proceeding did look like an exercise of jurisdiction, derogatory to a synodical resolution of the case, he was opposed by the oriental bishops, as usurping an undue power. Unto which charge he doth not answer directly, by asserting to himself any such authority by law or custom; but otherwise excusing himself. In the issue, the Pope's sentence was not peremptory; until, on examining the merits of the cause, it was approved for just, as to matter, by the synod of Sardica.‖ These things otherwhere we have largely showed; and consequently this instance is deficient.

He allegeth St. Chrysostom, as appealing to Pope Innocent I. but if you read his epistles to that Pope, you will find no such matter;** he doth only complain, and declare to him the

* Cypr. Ep. 55. ann. 252. † Cypr. Ep. 68.
‡ Ann. 350. § Socr. ii. 20. ‖ Ibid. ¶ Ibid.
** Tom. vii. Epist. 122. 123.

iniquity of the process against him, not as to a judge, but as to a friend and fellow-bishop concerned, that such injurious and mischievous dealings should be stopped; requesting from him, not judgment of his cause, but succor in procuring it by a general synod; to which indeed he did appeal, as Sozomen expressly telleth us; and as indeed he doth himself affirm.* Accordingly Pope Innocent did not assume to himself the judgment of his cause, but did endeavor to procure a synod for it, affirming it to be needful: why so, if his own judgment, according to his privilege, did suffice? Why indeed did not Pope Innocent (being well satisfied in the case, yea passionately touched with it) presently summon Theophilus and his adherents, undertaking the trial? Did Pope Nicholas I. proceed so in the case of Rhotaldus? Why was he content only "to write consolatory letters to him, and to his people;"† not pretending to undertake the decision of his cause? If the Pope had been endowed with such a privilege, it is morally impossible that it should not have shone forth clearly on this occasion; it could hardly be that St. Chrysostom himself should not in plain terms avow it; that he should not formally apply to it, as the most certain and easy way of finding relief; that he should not earnestly mind and urge the Pope to use his privilege: why should he speak of that tedious and difficult way of a general synod, when so short and easy a way was at hand? But the truth is, he did not know any such power the Pope had by himself. St. Chrysostom rather did conceive all such foreign judicatures to be unreasonable and unjust; for the argument which he darteth at Theophilus doth as well reach the papal jurisdiction on appeals; for, "It was," saith he, "not congruous, that an Egyptian should judge those in Thrace:" why not an Egyptian, as well as an Italian? And, "If," saith he, "this custom should prevail, and it become lawful for those who will to go into the parishes of others, even from such distances, and to cast out whom any one pleaseth, doing by their own authority what they please, know that all things will go to wreck—."‡ Why may not this be said of a Roman, as well as of an Alexandrian? St. Chrysostom also (we may observe) did not only apply himself to the Pope, but to other western bishops; particularly to the bishops of Milain and Aquileia, whom he called *Beatissimi Domini:* did he appeal to them?§

He allegeth Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, appealing

* Soz. viii. 17. Theod. v. 34. Soz. viii. 26.
† Theoph. Soz. viii. 26. ‡ Epist. 122.
§ Pallad. cap. 2.

to Pope Leo:* but let us consider the story. Flavianus for his orthodoxy (or on other accounts) very injuriously treated and oppressed by Dioscorus, who was supported by the favor of the imperial court, having in his case no other remedy, did appeal to the Pope; who alone among the patriarchs had dissented from those proceedings. The Pope was himself involved in the cause, being of the same persuasion; having been no less affronted and hardly treated (considering their power, and that he was out of their reach) and condemned by the same adversaries.

To him therefore, as to the leading bishop of Christendom, in the first place interested in defence of the common faith, together with a synod, not to him as sole judge, did Flavianus appeal. "He" (saith Placidia, in her Letter to Theodosius,) "did appeal to the apostolic see, and to all the bishops of these parts;"† that is, to the rest of Christendom, which were not engaged in the party of Dioscorus: and to whom else could he have appealed?

Valentinian, in his epistle to Theodosius, in behalf of Pope Leo, saith, that he did appeal "according to the manner of synods;" and whatever those words signify, that could not be to the Pope, as a single judge: for before that time in whatever synod was such an appeal made? what custom could there be favorable to such a pretence?

But what his appeal did import is best interpretable by the proceeding consequent; which was not the Pope's assuming to himself the judicature, either immediately or by delegation of judges, but endeavoring to procure a general synod for it; the which endeavor doth appear in many epistles to Theodosius and to his sister Pulcheria, soliciting that such a synod might be indicted by his order: "All the bishops," saith Pope Leo, "with sighs and tears do supplicate your grace, that because our agents did faithfully reclaim, and Bishop Flavianus did present them a libel of appeal, you would command a general synod to be celebrated in Italy."‡

Dioscorus and his party would scarce have been so silly as to condemn Flavianus, if they had known (which, if it had been a case clear in law or obvious in practice, they could not but have known) that the Pope, who was deeply engaged in the same cause, had a power to reverse (and revenge) their proceedings. Nor would the good emperor Theodosius so pertinaciously have maintained the proceedings of that Ephesine

* Liber. cap. 12. Marc. vii. 7. † Syn. Chalc. Act. i. p. 26.
‡ P. Leo. Epist. 25.

synod, if he had deemed the Pope duly sovereign governor and judge; or that a right of ultimate decision on appeal did appertain to him. Nor had the Pope needed to have taken so much pains in procuring a synod, if he could have judged without it. Nor would Pope Leo (a man of so much spirit and zeal for the dignity of his see) have been so wanting to the maintenance of his right, as not immediately to have proceeded unto trial of the cause, without precarious attendance for a synod. if he thought his pretence to such appeals as we now speak of, to have been good or plausible in the world at that time.

The next case is that of Theodoret. His words indeed, framed according to his condition, needing the patronage of Pope Leo, being then high in reputation, do sound favorably; but we abstracting from the sound of words must regard the reason of things. His words are these; "I expect the suffrage of your apostolic see, and beseech and earnestly entreat your holiness to succor me, who appeal to your right and just judicature."*

He never had been particularly or personally judged, and therefore did not need to appeal, as to a judge; nor therefore is his application to the Pope to be interpreted for such; but rather as to a charitable succorer of him in his distress, by his countenance and endeavor to relieve him.†

He only was supposed erroneous in faith, and a perilous abettor of Nestorianism, because he had smartly contradicted Cyril; which prejudice did cause him to be prohibited from coming to the synod of Ephesus; and there in his absence to be denounced heterodox.‡

His appeal then to the Pope (having no other recourse, in whom he did confide, finding him to concur with himself in opinion against Eutychianism) was no other than (as the word is often used in common speech, when we say, I appeal to your judgment in this or that case) a referring it to the Pope's consideration, whether his faith was sound and orthodox; capacitating him to retain his office: the which on his explication and profession thereof (presented in terms of extraordinary respect and deference) the Pope did approve; thereby (as a good divine, rather than as a formal judge) acquitting him of heterodoxy: the which approbation (in regard to the great opinion then had of the Pope's skill in those points, and to the favor he

* Theod. Ep. 113. (ad P. Leonem.)

† Vid. Ep. 112. ad Domnum.

‡ Epist. 145. Vid. Theod. Epist. supr. et Ep. 127. 129. Ep. 138. 139.

had obtained by contesting against the Eutychians) did bear great sway in the synod; so that (although not without opposition of many, and not on absolute terms) he was permitted to sit among the Fathers of Chalcedon.

Observations.

1. We do not read of any formal trial the Pope made of Theodoret's case; that he was cited, that his accusers did appear, that his cause was discussed; but only a simple approbation of him.

2. We may observe that Theodoret did write to Flavianus in like terms: "We entreat your holiness to fight in behalf of the faith which is assaulted, and to defend the canons which are trampled under foot."*

3. We may observe that Theodoret expecting this favor of Pope Leo, and thence being moved to commend the Roman see to the height, and to reckon its special advantages, doth not yet mention his supremacy of power, or universality of jurisdiction: for those words, "it befitteth you to be prime in all things," are only general words relating to the advantages which he subjoineth; of which he saith, "for your throne is adorned with many advantages,"† in a florid enumeration whereof he passeth over that of peculiar jurisdiction; he nameth the magnitude, splendor, majesty, and populousness of the city; the early faith praised by St. Paul, the sepulchres of the two great Apostles, and their decease there; but the Pope's being universal sovereign and judge (which was the main advantage whereof that see could be capable) he doth not mention: why? because he was not aware thereof, else surely he would not have passed it in silence.

4. We may also observe, that whatever the opinion of Theodoret was now concerning the Pope's power, he not long before did hardly take him for such a judge, when he did oppose Pope Celestine, concurring with Cyril, at the first Ephesine synod. He then indeed, looking on Pope Celestine as a prejudiced adversary, did not write to him, but to the other bishops of the west, as we see by those words in his epistle to Domnus; "And we have written to the bishops of the west about these things, to him of Milain, I say, to him of Aquileia, and him of Ravenna, testifying, &c."*

5. Yea we may observe that Theodoret did intend, with the

* Theod. Epist. 86.
† Theod. Ep. 116. (ad Renatum. Presb.)
‡ Theod. Epist. 112.

emperor's leave, to appeal, or refer his cause, to the whole body of western bishops, as himself doth express in those words to Anatolius, "I do pray your magnificence that you would request this favor of our dread sovereign, that I may have recourse to the west, and may be judged by the most religious and holy bishops there."*

Bellarmine farther doth allege the appeal of Hadrianus, bishop of Thebes, to Pope Gregory I.† the which he received and asserted by excommunicating the archbishop of Justiniana Prima, for deposing Hadrianus, without regard to that appeal. I answer,

1. The example is late, when the Popes had extended their power beyond the ancient and due limits: those maxims had got in before the time of that worthy Pope; who thought he might use the power of which he found himself possessed.

2. It is impertinent, because the bishop of Justiniana had then a special dependence on the Roman see: from whence an universal jurisdiction on appeal cannot be inferred.

3. It might be an usurpation; nor doth the opinion or practice of Pope Gregory suffice to determine a question of right; for good men are liable to prejudice, and its consequences.

To these instances produced by Bellarmine, some add the appeal of Eutyches to Pope Leo; to which it may be excepted, that if he did appeal, it was not to the Pope solely, but to him with the other patriarchs: so it is expressly said in the Acts of the Chalcedon synod; "His deposition being read, he did appeal to the holy synod of the most holy bishop of Rome, and of Alexandria, and of Jerusalem, and of Thessalonica:"‡ the which is an argument, that he did not apprehend the right of receiving appeals did solely or peculiarly belong to him of Rome.

Liberatus saith, that "Johannes Talaida went to Calendion, patriarch of Antioch, and taking of him intercessory synodical letters, appealed to Simplicius, bishop of Rome, as St. Athanasius had done, and persuaded him to write in his behalf to Acacius, bishop of Constantinople."§

In regard to any more instances of this kind we might generally propose these following considerations.

1. It is no wonder that any bishop being condemned, especially in causes relating to faith or common interest, should have recourse to the Roman bishop, or to any other bishop of great

* Theod. Ep. 119. (ad Anatol.)
† Greg. lib. ii. Indict. 11. Ep. 6. ‡ Syn. Chale. Act. 1.
§ Liber. cap. 18. Baron. ann. 483. sect. 1.

authority, for refuge or for relief; which they may hope to be procured by them by the influence of their reputation, and their power among their dependents.

2. Bad men, being deservedly corrected, will absurdly resort any whither with mouths full of clamor and calumny; if not with hope of relief, yet with design of revenge; as did Marcion, as did Felicissimus, as did Apiarius to the Pope.

3. Good men being abused will express some resentment, and complain of their wrongs, where they may presume of a fair and favorable hearing: so did Athanasius, Flavianus, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, apply themselves to the same bishops, florishing in so great reputation and wealth.

So did the monks of Egypt, (Ammonius and Isidorus,) from the persecutions of Theophilus, fly to the protection and succor of St. Chrysostom; which gave occasion to the troubles of that incomparable personage; the which is so illustrious an instance, that the words of the historian relating it deserve setting down.

"They jointly did endeavor that the trains against them might be examined by the emperor as judge, and by the bishop John; for they conceived that he having conscience of using a just freedom, would be able to succor them according to right: but he did receive the men applying to him courteously, and treated them respectfully, and did not hinder them from praying in the Church—He also writ to Theophilus to render communion to them, as being orthodox; and if there were need of judging their case by law, that he would send whom they thought good to prosecute the cause."*

If this had been to the Pope, it would have been alleged for an appeal; and it would have had as much color as any instance which they can produce.

4. And when men, either good or bad, do resort in this manner to great friends, it is no wonder, if they accost them in highest terms of respect, and with exaggerations of their eminent advantages; so inducing them to regard and favor their cause.

5. Neither is it strange that great persons favorably should entertain those who make such addresses to them, they always coming crouching in a suppliant posture, and with fair pretences; it being also natural to men to delight in seeing their power acknowleged; and it being a glorious thing to relieve the afflicted: for "eminence is wont to incline toward infirmity, and with a ready good-will to take part with those who

* Soz. viii. 13.

are under."* So when Basilides, when Marcellus, when Eustathius Sebastenus, when Maximus the Cynic, when Apiarius were condemned, the Pope was hasty to engage for them; more liking their application to him than weighing their cause.

6. And when any person doth continue long in a florishing estate, so that such addresses are frequently made to him, no wonder that an opinion of lawful power to receive them doth arise both in him and in others; so that of a voluntary friend he become an authorised protector, a pattern, a judge of such persons in such cases.

X. The sovereign is fountain of all jurisdiction; and all inferior magistrates derive their authority from his warrant and commission, acting as his deputies or ministers, according to that intimation in St. Peter—'whether to the king as supreme, or to governors as sent by him.'

Accordingly the Pope doth challenge this advantage to himself, that he is the fountain of ecclesiastical jurisdiction: pretending all episcopal power to be derived from him.

"The rule of the Church," saith Bellarmine, "is monarchical; therefore all authority is in one, and from him is derived to others;"† the which aphorism he well proveth from the form of creating bishops, as they call it; "We do provide such a church with such a person; and we do prefer him to be father and pastor and bishop of the said church; committing to him the administration in temporals and spirituals in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."‡

Pope Pius II. in his Bull of Retractation, thus expresseth the sense of his see; "In the militant Church, which resembleth the triumphant, there is one moderator and judge of all, the vicar of Jesus Christ, from whom, as from the head, all power and authority is derived to the subject members; the which doth immediately flow into it from the Lord Christ."§

A congregation of cardinals, appointed by Pope Paulus III. speaking after the style and sentiments of that see, did say to him, "Your holiness doth so bear the care of Christ's Church, that you have very many ministers, by which you manage that care; those are all the clergy, on whom the service of God is charged; especially priests, and more especially curates, and above all, bishops."‖

* Greg. Naz. Orat. 23. † Bell. iv. 24. Epiph. Hær. 42.
‡ Ibid. § P. Pius II. in Bull. Retract.
‖ Apud Cham. de Pont. Œcum. 10. 13.

Durandus, bishop of Mande, according to the sense of his age, saith, "The Pope is head of all bishops, from whom they as members from an head descend, and of whose fulness all receive; whom he calls to a participation of his care, but admits not into the fulness of his power."*

This pretence is seen in the ordinary titles of bishops, who style themselves bishops of such a place, "by the grace of God and of the apostolic see." O shame!

The men of the Tridentine convention (those great betrayers of the Church to perpetual slavery, and Christian truth to the prevalency of falsehood, till God pleaseth) do, on divers occasions, pretend to qualify and empower bishops to perform important matters, originally belonging to the episcopal function, as the Pope's delegates.†

But contrariwise according to the doctrine of holy Scripture, and the sense of the primitive Church, the bishops and pastors of the Church do immediately receive their authority and commission from God; being only his ministers.

The Scripture calleth them the ministers of God, and of Christ, (so Epaphras, so Timothy, in regard to their ecclesiastical function are named,) the stewards of God, the servants of God, fellow-servants of the Apostles.

The Scripture saith that 'the Holy Ghost had made them bishops to feed the Church of God;' that 'God had given them,' and 'constituted them in the Church; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ;' that is, to all effects and purposes concerning their office: for 'the work of the ministry' compriseth all the duty charged on them, whether in way of order or of governance;‡ as they now do precariously and groundlessly in reference to this case distinguish: and 'edifying the body' doth import all the designed effects of their office; particularly those which are consequent on the use of jurisdiction; the which St. Paul doth affirm was appointed for edification; 'according,' saith he, 'to the authority which God hath given me for edification, and not for destruction.' They do 'preside in the Lord.' They allow no other head but our Lord, 'from whom all the body,' &c.

The Fathers clearly do express their sentiments to be the same.

St. Ignatius saith that the bishop "doth preside in the place

* Durand. Mimat. Offic. ii. 1. 17.

† This was an expedient. Vid. Concil.

‡ Bell. iv. 25.

of God;"* and that "we must look on him as our Lord himself," (or as our Lord's representative;) that therefore "we must be subject to him as unto Jesus Christ."†

St. Cyprian affirmeth "each bishop to be constituted by the judgment of God and of Christ:" and "that in his church he is for the present a judge in the place of Christ:"—and "that our Lord Jesus Christ, one and alone, hath a power both to prefer us to the governmc) of his Church, and to judge of our acting."‡

St. Basil; "A prelate is nothing else but one that sustaineth the person of Christ."§

St. Chrysostom; "We have received the commission of ambassadors, and come from God; for this is the dignity of the episcopal office."||

"It behoveth us all, who by divine authority are constituted in the priesthood, to prevent," &c.¶

Wherefore the ancient bishops did all of them take themselves to be vicars of Christ, not of the Pope, and no less than the proudest Pope of them all; whence it was ordinary for them in their addresses and compellations to the bishop of Rome, and in their speech about him, to call him their brother, their colleague, their fellow-minister; which had not been modest or just, if they had been his ministers or shadows. Yea, the Popes themselves, even the highest and haughtiest of them, who of any in old times did most stand on their presumed preeminence, did yet vouchsafe to call other bishops their fellow-bishops and fellow-ministers.

Those bishops of France with good reason did complain of Pope Nicholas I. "for calling them his clerks; whenas, if his pride had suffered him, he should have acknowleged them for his brethren and fellow-bishops."**

In fine, the ancient bishops did not allege any commission from the Pope to warrant their jurisdiction, but from God; "If Moses's chair were so venerable, that what was said out of that ought therefore to be heard, how much more is Christ's throne so? We succeed him, from that we speak, since Christ has committed to us the ministry of reconciliation."††

"That which is committed to the priest, it is only in God's power to give."‡‡

* Ign. ad Magnes. † Ign. ad Eph. Ign. ad Trall.
‡ Cypr. Ep. 52. et alibi sæpe. Id. in Conc. Carthag.
§ Bas. Const. Mon. cap. 22. || Chrys. in Coloss. Orat. 3.
¶ Anatol. in Syn. Chalc. p. 512. ** Ann. Pith.
†† Chrys. in Coloss. Orat. 3. ‡‡ Chrys. in Joh. Orat. 83.

"Since we also, by the mercy of Christ our King and God, were made ministers of the Gospel."*

This is a modern dream, born out of ambition and flattery, which never came into the head of any ancient divine.

It is a ridiculous thing to imagine that Cyprian, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Austin, &c. did take themselves for the vicegerents or ministers of the Popes; if they did, why did they not, so frequent occasion being given them, in all their volumes, ever acknowlege it? why cannot Bellarmine and his complices, after all their prolling, show any passage in them importing any such acknowlegement; but are fain to infer it by far-fetched sophisms, from allegations plainly impertinent or frivolous?

The Popes indeed in the fourth century began to practise a fine trick, very serviceable to the enlargement of their power; which was to confer on certain bishops, as occasion served, or for continuance, the title of their vicar or lieutenant: thereby pretending to impart authority to them: whereby they were enabled for performance of divers things, which otherwise by their own episcopal or metropolitical power they could not perform. By which device they did engage such bishops to such a dependence on them, whereby they did promote the papal authority in provinces, to the oppression of the ancient rights and liberties of bishops and synods, doing what they pleased under pretence of this vast power communicated to them; and for fear of being displaced, or out of affection to their favorer, doing what might serve to advance the Papacy.

Thus did Pope Celestine constitute Cyril in his room.†

Pope Leo appointed Anatolius of Constantinople.

Pope Felix Acacius of Constantinople.‡

Pope Hormisdas Epiphanius of Constantinople.

Pope Simplicius to Zeno bishop of Seville—"We thought it convenient that you should be held up by the vicariat authority of our see."§

So did Siricius and his successors constitute the bishops of Thessalonica to be their vicars in the diocese of Illyricum, wherein being then a member of the western empire they had caught a special jurisdiction; to which Pope Leo did refer in those words, which sometimes are impertinently alleged with reference to all bishops, but concern only Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica; "We have intrusted thy charity to be in our

* Flavian. in Chalc. Act. i. p. 4. † Evagr. Act. Eph. p. 134.
‡ Act. Conc. sub Menna. p. 70.
§ Baron. ann. 482. sect. 46.

stead, so that thou art called into part of the solicitude, not into plenitude of the authority."*

So did Pope Zozimus bestow a like pretence of vicarious power on the bishop of Arles, which city was the seat of the temporal exarch in Gaul.†

So to the bishop of Justiniana Prima in Bulgaria, (or Dardania Europæa,) the like privilege was granted, [by procurement of the emperor Justinian, native of that place.]

Afterwards temporary or occasional vicars were appointed, (such as Austin in England, Boniface in Germany,) who in virtue of that concession did usurp a paramount authority; and by the exercise thereof did advance the papal interest; depressing the authority of metropolitans, and provincial synods.

So at length legates, on occasion dispatched into all countries of the west, came to do there what they pleased, using that pretence to oppress and abuse both clergy and people very intolerably.

Whence divers countries were forced to make legal provisions for excluding such legates, finding by much experience that their business was to rant and domineer in the Pope's name, to suck money from the people, and to maintain luxurious pomp on expense of the countries where they came.‡

Of this John XXII. doth solely complain; and decrees that all people should admit his legates, under pain of interdicts.§

In England Pope Paschal finds the same fault in his letter to King Henry I. "Nuncios, or letters from the apostolic see, unless by your majesty's command, are not thought worthy any admittance or reception within your jurisdiction: none complains thence, none appeals thence for judgment to the apostolic see."‖

The Pope observing what authority and reverence the archbishops of Canterbury had in this nation, whereby they might be able to check his attemps, did think good to constitute those archbishops his legates of course, (*legatos natos*,) that so they might seem to exercise their jurisdiction by authority derived from him; and owing to him that mark of favor, or honor, with enlargement of power, might pay him more devotion, and serve his interests.

Bellarmine doth from this practice prove the Pope's sovereign

* P. Leo. Ep. 84. (ad Anastas. Thessal.)

† P. Joh. VIII. Ep. 93.

‡ P. Pasch. II. Epist. apud Eadm. p. 113. &c.

§ Extrav. commun. i. 1. (p. 310.) Occulti inimici regni. Matt. Par. p. 524.

‖ P. Pasch. II. Eadm. p. 113.

power; but he might from thence better have demonstrated their great cunning. It might from such extraordinary designation of viceregents, with far more reason be inferred, that ordinarily bishops are not his ministers.

XI. It is the privilege of a sovereign that he cannot be called to account, or judged, or deposed, or debarred communion, or anywise censured and punished; for this implieth a contradiction or confusion in degrees, subjecting the superior to inferiors; this were making a river run backwards; this were to dam up the fountain of justice; to behead the state; to expose majesty to contempt.

Wherefore the Pope doth pretend to this privilege, according to those maxims in the Canon Law, drawn from the sayings of Popes (either forged or genuine, but all alike) obtaining authority in their court.*

And according to what Pope Adrian let the eighth synod know, "because," says he, "the apostolic church of Rome stoops not to the judgment of lesser churches."† They cite also three old synods, (of Sinuessa, of Rome under Pope Silvester, of Rome under Sixtus III.) but they are palpably spurious, and the learned amongst them confess it.

But antiquity was not of this mind; for it did suppose him no less obnoxious to judgment and correction than other bishops, if he should notoriously deviate from the faith, or violate canonical discipline.

The canons generally do oblige bishops without exception to duty, and (on defailance) to correction: why is not he excepted, if to be excused or exempted?

It was not questioned of old, but that a Pope, in case he should notoriously depart from the faith, or notably infringe discipline, might be excommunicated: the attempting it on divers occasions doth show their opinion, although it often had not effect, because the cause was not just and plausible; the truth and equity of the case appearing to be on the Pope's side.

St. Isidore Pelusiota denieth of any bishop's office, that it is ἀρχὴ ἀνυπεύθυνος, 'an uncontrollable government.'

In the times of Polycrates and Pope Victor the whole eastern church did forbear communion with the Pope.‡ Firmilian told Pope Stephanus, that by conceiting he might excommunicate all other bishops, he had excommunicated himself.

* Bell. ii. 26. de Conc. ii. 17. Grat. Dist. xl. cap. 6. xxi. 7. Caus. ix. qu. 3. cap. 10.—— Extrav. comm. lib. i. tit. 8. cap. 1. P. Leo IX. Ep. i. cap. 10. &c.

† P. Adrian. in Syn. VIII. Act. vii. p. 963.

‡ Epiph. Hær. 70. Audianorum.

The Fathers of the Antiochene synod did threaten to excommunicate and depose Pope Julius. "They did promise to Julius peace and communion, if he did admit the deposition of those whom they had expelled, and the constitution of those whom they had ordained; but if he did resist their decrees, they denounced the contrary."* The oriental bishops at Sardica did excommunicate and depose him.† St. Hilary did anathematise Pope Liberius on his defection to the Arians. Dioscorus did attempt to excommunicate Pope Leo.‡ Acacius of Constantinople renounced the communion of Pope Felix.§ Timotheus Ælurus cursed the Pope. The "African bishops did synodically excommunicate Pope Vigilius."‖ Pope Anastasius was rejected by his own clergy. Pope Constantine by the people; and so was Pope Leo. VIII. Divers bishops of Italy and Illyricum did abstain from the Pope's communion for a long time, because they did admit the fifth synod. Photius did excommunicate and depose Pope Nicholas I.¶ Maurus, bishop of Ravenna, did anathematise Pope Vitalianus.** The emperor Otho II. having with good advice labored to reclaim Pope John XII. without effect, did "indict a council, calling together the bishops of Italy, by the judgment of whom the life of that wicked man should be judged:"†† and the issue was, that he was deposed. Pope Nicholas I. desired to be judged by the emperor. The fifth synod did in general terms condemn Pope Vigilius; and the emperor Justinian did banish him for not complying with the decrees of it. The sixth and seventh general synods did anathematise Honorius by name, when he was dead, because his heresy was not before confuted; and they would have served him so, if he had been alive. Divers synods (that of Worms, of Papia, of Brescia, of Mentz, of Rome, &c.) did reject Pope Gregory VII.‡‡ Pope Adrian himself in the eighth synod (so called) did confess that a Pope being found deviating from the faith might be judged, as Honorius was. Gerbertus§§ (afterward Pope Sylvester II.) did maintain that Popes might be held as

* Sozom. iii. 8. † Ibid. 11.
‡ Evag. ii. 4.
§ Niceph. xvi. 17. Baron. ann. 484. §. 35.
‖ Vict. Tun. post Cons. Basilii V. C. ann. 10.
¶ Vit. Ignatii. Patr. apud Bin. p. 892. Baron. ann. 863——.
** Luitprand. vi. 6.
†† Plat. in Joh. XIII. (pro XII.) Vid. Baron. ann. 960. et Binium.
‡‡ Ann. 1076. Vid. Baron. ann 1033. sect. 3.
§§ Baron. ann. 992. sect. 44—.

ethnics and publicans, if "they did not hear the Church." The synod of Constance did judge and depose three Popes.

The synod of Basil did depose Pope Eugenius; affirming that "the Catholic Church hath often corrected and judged Popes, when they either erred from the faith, or by their ill manners became notoriously scandalous to the Church."*

The practice of Popes to give an account of their faith (when they entered on their office) to the other patriarchs and chief bishops, approving themselves thereby worthy and capable of communion, doth imply them liable to judgment.† Of the neglect of which practice Euphemius, bishop of Constantinople, did complain.‡

Of this we have for example the synodical epistles of Pope Gregory I.§

XII. To the sovereign in ecclesiastical affairs it would belong to define and decide controversies in faith, discipline, moral practice; so that all were bound to admit his definitions, decisions, interpretations. He would be the supreme interpreter of the divine law, and judge of controversies. No point or question of moment should be decided without his cognisance. This he therefore doth pretend to; taking on him to define points, and requiring from all submission to his determinations. Nor doth he allow any synods to decide questions.

But the ancients did know no such thing. In case of contentions, they had no recourse to his judgment; they did not stand to his opinion, his authority did not avail to quash disputes. They had recourse to the holy Scriptures, to Catholic tradition, to reason; they disputed and discussed points by dint of argument.

Irenæus, Tertullian, Vincentius Lirinensis, and others, discoursing of the methods to resolve points of controversy, did not reckon the Pope's authority for one. Divers of the Fathers did not scruple openly to dissent from the opinions of Popes; nor were they wondered at, or condemned for it.

So St. Paul did withstand St. Peter. St. Polycarpus dissented from Pope Elutherius. So Polycrates from Pope Victor. So St. Cyprian from Pope Stephen. So Dionysius Alex. from Pope Stephen. All which persons were renowned for wisdom and piety in their times.

Highest controversies were appeased by synods out of the

* Conc. Bass. Sess. 12. † P. Gelas. I. Ep. 1. ad Laur.
‡ Gelas. Ep. 9. Baron. ann. 492. sect. 10.
§ Vid. Tract. de Unit. Eccl.

holy Scripture, Catholic tradition, the analogy of faith, and common reason, without regard to the Pope. Divers synods in Afric and Asia defined the point about rebaptisation without the Pope's leave, and against his opinion. The synod of Antioch condemned the doctrine of Paulus Samosatenus, without intervention of the Pope, before they gave him notice. In the synod of Nice the Pope had very small stroke. The general synod of Constantinople declared the point of the divinity of the Holy Ghost against Macedonius, without the Pope; who did no more than afterward consent: this the synod of Chalcedon, in their compellation to the emperor Marcian, did observe; "The Fathers met in Sardica to suppress the relics of Arianism, communicated their decrees to the eastern bishops; and they who here discovered the pestilence of Apolinarius, made known theirs to the western."*

The synod of Afric defined against Pelagius, before their informing Pope Innocentius thereof; not seeking his judgment, but desiring his consent to that which they were assured to be truth.

Divers Popes have been incapable of deciding controversies, themselves having been erroneous in the questions controverted: as Pope Stephanus, (in part,) Pope Liberius, Pope Felix, Pope Vigilius, Pope Honorius, &c. And in our opinion all Popes for many ages.

It is observable how the synod of Chalcedon, in their allocution to the emperor Marcian, do excuse Pope Leo for expounding the faith, in his epistle, (the which it seems some did reprehend as a novel method disagreeable to the canons;) "Let not them," say they, "object to us the epistle of the marvellous prelate of Rome, as obnoxious to imputation of novelty; but if it be not consonant to the Scriptures, let them confute it; or if it be not consentaneous to the Fathers who have preceded; or if it be not apt to confute the irreligious," &c.†

It was not his judicial authority which they did insist on, to maintain his epistle, but the orthodoxy and intrinsic usefulness of it to confute errors; on which account they did embrace and confirm it by their suffrage.

XIII. If the Pope were a sovereign of the Church, as they make him, it were at least expedient that he should be infallible; for why otherwise should he undertake confidently to pronounce in all cases, to define high and difficult points, to impose his dictates, and require assent from all? if he be fal-

* Conc. Chalced. ad Marc. Orat. p. 468.

† Act. Syn. Chalc. p. 465.

lible, it is very probable that often he doth obtrude errors on us for matters of faith and practice.

Wherefore the true fast friends of papal interest do assert him to be infallible,* when he dictateth as Pope, and setting himself into his chair doth thence mean to instruct the whole Church, And the Pope therefore himself, who countenanceth them, may be presumed to be of that mind.

Pighius said bouncingly, "The judgment of the apostolic see with a council of domestic priests, is far more certain than the judgment of an universal council of the whole earth without the Pope."†

This is the syllogism we propose:

The supreme judge must be infallible;

The Pope is not infallible: therefore—

The major, the Jesuits, canonists, and courtiers are obliged to prove, it being their assertion; and they do prove it very wisely and strongly.

The minor is asserted by the French doctors; and they do with clear evidence maintain it.

The conclusion we leave them to infer who are concerned.

It is in effect Pope Gregory's argumentation; no bishop can be universal bishop, (or universal pastor and judge of the Church,) because no bishop can be infallible; for that the lapse of such a pastor would throw down the Church into ruin, by error and impiety. "Therefore the universal Church, which God forbid, falls, when he falls who is called universal.—The state and order of our Lord's family will decay, when that which is required in the body is not to be found in the head."‡

But that he is not infallible much experience and history do abundantly show.

The ancients knew no such pretender to infallibility; otherwise they would have left disputing, and run to his oracular dictates for information. They would have only asserted this point against heretics, We should have had testimonies of it innumerable, It had been the most famous point of all.§

I will not mention Pope Stephanus universally approving the baptism of heretics against the decrees of the synod of Nice and other synods. Nor Pope Liberius complying with Arianism. Nor Pope Innocent I. and his followers, at least

* Bell. lib. iv. † Pighius de Hier. lib. 6.
‡ Greg. M. Epist. iv. 32. P. Leo. Ep. 87.
§ Aug. de Bapt. contr. Don. ii. 5.

till Pope Gelasius,* first asserting the communion of infants for needful. Nor Pope Vigilius dodging with the fifth synod. Nor Pope Honorius condemned by so many councils and Popes for monothelitism. But surely Pope Leo† and Pope Gelasius were strangely deceived, when they condemned partaking in one kind. Pope Gregory was foully out, when he condemned the worship of images;‡ and when he so declaimeth against the title of universal bishop; and when he avowed himself a subject to the Emperor Mauritius; and when he denied the books of Maccabees to be canonical; and when he asserted the perfection of holy Scripture.§ Pope Leo II. was mistaken, when he did charge his infallible predecessor Honorius of monothelitism; Pope Nicholas was a little deceived, when he determined the attrition of Christ's body.‖ Pope Urban II. was out, when he allowed it lawful for good Catholics to commit murder on persons excommunicate.¶ Pope Innocent IV. erred, when he called kings the Pope's slaves.**

Surely those Popes did err, who confirmed the synods of Constance and Basil; not excepting the determinations in favor of general councils being superior to Popes.†† All those Popes have devilishly erred, who have pretended to dispose of kingdoms; to depose princes; to absolve subjects of their oaths. Pope Adrian II. did not take the Pope to be infallible, when he said he might not be judged, excepting the case of heresy; and thereby excuseth the orientals for anathematizing Honorius, he being accused of heresy.

There is one heresy, of which, if all histories do not lie grievously, divers Popes have been guilty; a heresy defined by divers Popes; the heresy of simony.‡‡ How many such heretics have sat in that chair! of which how many Popes are proclaimed guilty with a loud voice in history! "The hand," says St. Bernard, "does all the papal business: show me a man in all this greatest city who would admit thee to be Pope

* P. Gelas. I. Ep. ix. p. 636. † De Consecr. Dist. ii. cap. 12.
‡ Greg. Ep. vii. 110. ii. 62. iv. 32. 36. 38. vi. 30.
§ In Job. lib. xix. cap. 13. xviii. 14.
‖ Grat. de Consecr. Dist. ii. cap. 42.
¶ Grat. Caus. xxiii. qu. 5. cap. 47.
** Mancipia Papæ. Matt. Paris. ann. 1253.
†† Joh. XXII. Gerson. Serm. in Pasch. Occam. Celestinus——. Alph. a Castro. Hær. i. 4. Bin. tom. vii. p. 994.
‡‡ P. Greg. VII. Ep. lib. iii. 7. Simoniaca hæresis.
P. Jul. II. Conc. Lat. Sess. 5. (p. 57.)
Idem electus non apostolicus, sed apostaticus, et tanquam hæresiarcha, &c. Ibid. Tract. iv. sect. 12. 16.

without the mediation of a bribe!"* Yea how few for some ages have been guiltless of this heresy! It may be answered, they were no Popes, because their election was null; but then the Church hath often and long been without a head. Then numberless acts have been void; and creations of cardinals have been null; and consequently there hath not probably been any true Pope for a long time.

In the judgment of so many great divines, which did constitute the synod of Basil, many Popes (near all surely) have been heretics; who have followed or countenanced the opinion, that Popes are superior to general councils; the which there is flatly declared heresy. Pope Eugenius by name was there declared "a pertinacious heretic, deviating from the faith."†

It often happeneth that the Pope is not skilled in divinity, as Pope Innocent X. was wont to profess concerning himself, (to wave discourse about theological points:) he therefore cannot pronounce, in use of ordinary means, but only by miracle, as Balaam's ass. So Pope Innocent X. said that "the vicar of Jesus Christ was not obliged to examine all things by dispute; for that the truth of his decrees depended only on divine inspiration."‡ What is this but downright quakerism, enthusiasm, imposture?

Pope Clemens V. did not take himself to be infallible, when in his great synod of Vienna, the question, whether, beside remission of sin, also virtue were conferred to infants, he resolved thus very honestly,—"The second opinion, which says, that informing grace and virtues are in baptism conferred both on infants and adult persons, we think fit with the consent of the holy council to be chosen; as being more probable, and more consonant and agreeable to the divinity of the modern doctors."§

Which of the two Popes were in the right, Pope Nicholas IV. who decided that our Lord was so poor that he had right to nothing, or Pope John XXII. who declared this to be a heresy, charging our Lord with injustice?‖

XIV. A sovereign is in dignity and authority superior to any number of subjects, however conjoined or congregated; as a head is above all the members, however compacted: he is not supreme, who is anywise subject or inferior to a senate, or any assembly in his territory.

* Bern. de Consid. iv. 2.

† Concil. Basil. Sess. xxxiv. p. 96. 107.

‡ Memor. Hist. de 5. Propos. § Clem. in Tit. 1.

‖ Bell. iv. 14. (p. 1318.) Confer. Sext. lib. v. tit. 12. cap. 3. Extrav. Joh. XXII. tit. xiv. cap. 3. 4. 5.

Therefore the Pope doth claim a superiority over all councils;* pretending that their determinations are invalid without his consent and confirmation; that he can rescind or make void their decrees; that he can suspend their consultations, and translate or dissolve them.

And Baronius reckons this as one error in Hincmarus, bishop of Rheims, "that he held as if the canons of councils were of greater authority in the church of God than the decrees of Popes, which," says he, "how absurd and unreasonable an opinion it is," &c.†

"That the authority of the apostolic see in all Christian ages has been preferred before the universal Church, both the canons of our predecessors and manifold tradition do confirm."‡

This is a question stiffly debated among Romanists: but the most (as Æneas Sylvius, afterward Pope Pius II. did acutely observe) with good reason do adhere to the Pope's side, because the Pope disposeth of benefices, but councils give none.

But in truth anciently the Pope was not understood superior to councils: for "greater is the authority of the world than of one city,"§ says St. Jerome. He was but one bishop, that had nothing to do out of his precinct. He had but his vote in them; he had the first vote, as the patriarch of Alexandria the second, of Antioch the third—but that order neither gave to him or them any advantage as to decision; but common consent, or the suffrages of the majority, did prevail. He was conceived subject to the canons no less than other bishops. Councils did examine matters decreed by him, so as to follow or forsake them as they saw cause. The Popes themselves did profess great veneration and observance of conciliar decrees. Pope Leo I. did oppose a canon of the synod of Chalcedon, (not pretending his superiority to councils, but the inviolability of the Nicene canons,) but it notwithstanding that opposition did prevail.

Even in the dregs of times, when the Pope had clambered so high to the top of power, this question in great numerous synods of bishops was agitated, and positively decided against him; both in doctrine and practice.‖

The synod of Basil affirmeth the matter of these decrees to be a "verity of the Christian faith, which whoever doth perti-

* Bellarm. de Concil. ii. 17.

† Baron. ad ann. 992. sect. 56. Concil. Later. V. Sess. 11. p. 152.

‡ P. Gelas. I. Ep. 8. (O impudentiam!) § Hier. ad Evag.

‖ Concil. Const. Sess. iv. (p. 1003.) Conc. Bass. Sess. 2. 33.

naciously resist, is to be deemed a heretic."*—Those Fathers say, that "none of the skilful did ever doubt of this truth, that the Pope, in things belonging to faith, was subject to the judgment of the same general councils——that the council has an authority immediately from Christ, which the Pope is bound to obey."† Those synods were confirmed by Popes, without exception of those determinations.

Great churches, most famous universities, a mighty store of learned doctors of the Roman communion, have reverenced those councils, and adhered to their doctrine. Insomuch that the Cardinal of Lorrain did affirm him to be an heretic in France, who did hold the contrary.

These things sufficiently demonstrate that the Pope cannot pretend to supremacy by universal tradition; and if he cannot prove it by that, how can he prove it? Not surely by Scripture, nor by decrees of ancient synods, nor by any clear and convincing reason.

XV. The sovereign of the Church is by all Christians to be acknowleged the chief person in the world, inferior and subject to none; above all commands; the greatest emperor being his sheep and subject.

He therefore now doth pretend to be above all princes. Divers Popes have affirmed this superiority. They are allowed and most favored by him who teach this doctrine. In their missal he is preferred above all kings, being prayed for before them.

But in the primitive times this was not held; for St. Paul requires 'every soul to be subject to the higher powers.' Then the emperor was avowed the first person, next to God; "To whom," says Tertullian, "they are second, after whom they are first, before all and above all gods. Why? &c.——we worship the emperor as a man next to God, and less only than God."‡ And Optatus,——"Since there is none above the emperor but God who made him.——While Donatus extolleth himself above the emperor, he raises himself, as it were, above humanity, and thinks himself to be God, and not man. For the king is the top and head of all things on earth."§ Then even "apostles, evangelists, prophets, all men whoever were subject to the emperor." The emperors did command them, "even the blessed bishops and patriarchs of old Rome, Con-

* Concil. Bas. Sess. 33.
† Conc. Basil. Decret. p. 117.
‡ Tertul. Apol. cap. 30. Tertul. ad Scap. cap. 2.
§ Opt. 3. Vid. Tr. v. sect. 14. Chrys. 'Ανδρ. β. p. 463.

stantinople, Alexandria, Theopolis, and Jerusalem."* Divers Popes did avow themselves subject to the emperor.

XVI. The confirmation of magistrates, elected by others, is a branch of supremacy which the Pope doth assume.†

Baronius saith that this was the ancient custom; and that Pope Simplicius did confirm the election of Calendion, bishop of Antioch. [Ann. 482. §. 1.]

"Meletius confirmed the most holy Gregory in the bishopric of Constantinople."‡

But the truth is, that anciently bishops being elected did only give an account of their choice unto all bishops; especially to those of highest rank, desiring their approbation and friendship, for preservation of due communion, correspondence, and peace. So the synod of Antioch gave account to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, "and all their fellow-ministers throughout the world," &c.§ of the election of Domnus after Paulus Samosatenus. So the Fathers of Constantinople acquainted Pope Damasus and the western bishops with the constitution of Nectarius, Flavianus, &c.

This was not to request confirmation, as if the Pope or other bishops could reject the election, if regular, but rather to assure whom they were to communicate with. "We have (say the Fathers of the synod against Paulus Samosatenus) signified this (our choosing of Domnus into Paulus's room,) that you may write to him, and receive letters of communion from him."‖ And St. Cyprian, "That you and our colleagues may know to whom they may write, and from whom they may receive letters."¶

Thus the bishops of Rome themselves did acquaint other bishops with their election, their faith, &c.** So did Cornelius; whom therefore St. Cyprian asserteth as established by the consent and approbation of his colleagues; "When the place of Peter and the sacerdotal chair was void, which by God's will being occupied, and with all our consents confirmed," &c.†† and the testimony of our fellow-bishops, the whole number of which all over the world unanimously consented."‡‡

The emperor did confirm bishops, as we see by that notable passage in the synod of Chalcedon; where Bassianus, bishop of

* Justinian. Novel. cxxiii. cap. 3. P. Greg. M. Ep. ii. 62. supra in præf. sect. iv. tract. 5. sect. 14.

† Vid. sect. 5. Dist. lxiii. cap. 4. P. Nic. I. Ep.

‡ Theod. v. 8. § Euseb. vii. 30. ‖ Euseb. ibid.

¶ Cypr. Ep. 55. (ad Cornel.)

** Vid. P. Greg. Tract. de Unit. Eccl. †† Cypr. Ep. 52.

‡‡ Ibid.

Ephesus, pleading for himself saith, "Our most religious emperor knowing these things presently ratified it, and by a memorial published it, confirming the bishopric; afterwards he sent his rescript by Eustathius, the silentiary again confirming it."*

XVII. It is a privilege of sovereigns to grant "privileges, exemptions, dispensations."

This he claimeth;† but against the laws of God and rights of bishops; against the decrees of the synods—against the sense of good men in all times.

XVIII. It is a prerogative of sovereign power, to erect, translate spiritual presidences.

Wherefore this the Pope claimeth. *Cum ex illo*, &c.‡

But at first he had nothing to do therein, except in his own province or diocese.

As Christianity did grow and enter into cities, so the neighbor bishops did ordain bishops there.

Princes often, as they did endow, so they did erect episcopal sees, and did, as was suitable, change places.

Pope Paschal II. doth by complaining attest to this, writing to the archbishop of Poland, "What shall I say of the translations of bishops, which among you are presumed to be made, not by apostolic authority, but the king's command?"§

XIX. It is a great prerogative of sovereignty to impose taxes on the clergy or people.

Wherefore the Pope doth assume this; as for instance that decree of Pope Innocent IV. in the first synod of Lyons; "By the common consent of the council we ordain that all the clergy, as well as those who are under authority as the prelates, pay for three years a twentieth part of their ecclesiastical revenues towards the assistance of the holy land, into the hands of those who shall be thereto appointed by the prudence of the apostolic see—and let all know that this they are bound faithfully to do under pain of excommunication."||

But antiquity knew no such impositions; when the Church, the clergy, the poor were maintained and relieved by voluntary offerings, or obventions.

Even the invidious splendor of the Roman bishop was supported by the oblations of matrons, as Marcellinus observeth.¶

* Conc. Chalc. Act. xi. (p. 404.) † Vid. Bern.
‡ P. Innoc. III. in Greg. Decr. lib. i. tit. 7. cap. 1.—&c.
§ P. Pasch. II. Ep 6. Eadm. p. 115.
|| Lugdun. Concil. 1. (anno 1245.)
¶ Marcel. 27. Vid. Const. Apost. ii. 25. Cod. Lib. i. tit. 3. sect. 42.

This is an encroachment on the rights of princes, unto whom clergymen are subjects, and bound 'to render tribute to whom tribute belongeth.'

SUPPOSITION VII.

A farther grand assertion of the Roman party is this, "that the papal supremacy is indefectible and unalterable."

But good reasons may be assigned, why, even supposing that the Pope had an universal sovereignty in virtue of his succession to St. Peter conferred on him, it is not assuredly consequent that it must always, or doth now belong to him. For it might be settled on him, not absolutely, but on conditions, the which failing, his authority may expire. It might be God's will that it should only continue for a time. And there are divers ways whereby, according to common rules of justice, he might be disseised thereof.

1. If God had positively declared his will concerning this point, that such a sovereignty was by him granted irrevocably and immutably, so that in no case it might be removed or altered, then indeed it must be admitted for such; but if no such declaration doth appear, then to assert it for such is to derogate from his power and providence; by exemption of this case from it. It is the ordinary course of providence so to confer power of any kind or nature on men, as to reserve to himself the liberty of transferring it, qualifying it, extending or contracting it, abolishing it, according to his pleasure, in due seasons and exigences of things. Whence no human power can be supposed absolutely stable, or immoveably fixed in one person or place.

2. No power can have a higher source, or firmer ground, than that of the civil government hath; for 'all such power is from heaven:' and in relation to that it is said, 'There is no power but from God; the powers that are, are ordained by God:' but yet such power is liable to various alterations, and is like the sea, having ebbs and flows, and ever changing its bounds, either personal or local.

Any temporal jurisdiction may be lost by those revolutions and vicissitudes of things, to which all human constitutions are subject; and which are ordered 'by the will and providence of the Most High, who ruleth in the kingdom of men, appointing over it whom he pleaseth; putting down one, and setting up another.'

Adam, by God's appointment, was sovereign of the world; and his first-born successors derived the same power from him: yet in course of time that order hath been interrupted, and divers independent sovereignties do take place.

Every prince hath his authority from God, or by virtue of divine ordination, within his own territory; and according to God's ordinance the lawful successor hath a right to the same authority; yet by accidents such authority doth often fail totally, or in part, changing its extent.

Why then may not any spiritual power be liable to the same vicissitudes? Why may not a prelate be degraded as well as a prince? Why may not the Pope, as well as the emperor, lose all, or part of his kingdom?

Why may not the successor of Peter, no less than the heir of Adam, suffer a defailure of jurisdiction?

That spiritual corporations, persons, and places, are subject to the same contingencies with others, as there is like reason to suppose, so there are examples to prove: God removed his sanctuary from Shiloh; 'Go ye now unto my place, which was in Shiloh, where I set my name at first,' &c. He deserted Jerusalem. He removeth the candlesticks. He placed Eli (of the family of Ithamar) in the high-priesthood, and displaced his race from it; 'I said indeed,' saith God, 'that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me for ever: but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me,' &c.

3. The reason and exigency of things might be sufficient ground for altering an universal jurisdiction; for when it should prove very inconvenient or hurtful, God might order such an alteration to happen, and men be obliged to allow it.

As God first did institute one universal monarchy, but that form (on the multiplication of mankind, and peopling of the earth) proving incommodious, Providence gave way for its change, and the setting up of particular governments; to which men are bound to submit: so God might institute a singular presidency of the Church; but when the Church grew vastly extended, so that such a government would not conveniently serve the whole, he might order a division, in which we should acquiesce.

4. It hath ever been deemed reasonable, and accordingly been practised, that the Church, in its exterior form and political administrations, should be suited to the state of the world, and constitution of worldly governments, that there might be no clashing or disturbance from each to other.

Wherefore, seeing the world is now settled under so many

civil sovereignties, it is expedient that ecclesiastical discipline should be so modelled, as to comply with each of them.

And it is reasonable that any pretence of jurisdiction should veil to the public good of the Church and the world.

That it should be necessary for the Church to retain the same form of policy or measure of power affixed to persons or places, can nowise be demonstrated by sufficient proof, and it is not consistent with experience; which showeth the Church to have subsisted with variations of that kind.

There hath in all times been found much reason or necessity to make alterations, as well in the places and bounds of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, as of secular empire.

Wherefore St. Peter's monarchy, reason requiring, might be cantonised into divers spiritual supremacies; and as other ecclesiastical jurisdictions have been chopped and changed, enlarged or diminished, removed and extinguished, so might that of the Roman bishop. The Pope cannot retain power in any state against the will of the prince: he is not bound to suffer correspondences with foreigners, especially such who apparently have interests contrary to his honor and the good of his people.

5. Especially that might be done, if the continuance of such a jurisdiction should prove abominably corrupt, or intolerably grievous to the Church.

6. That power is defectible which according to the nature and course of things doth sometime fail.

But the papal succession hath often been interrupted by contingencies, (of sedition, schism, intrusion, simoniacal election, deposition, &c. as before showed,) and is often interrupted by vacancies from the death of the incumbents.

7. If, leaving their dubious and false suppositions, (concerning divine institution, succession to St. Peter, &c.) we consider the truth of the case, and indeed the more grounded plea of the Pope, that papal preeminence was obtained by the wealth and dignity of the Roman city, and by the collation or countenance of the imperial authority; then by the defect of such advantages it may cease or be taken away; for when Rome hath ceased to be the capital city, the Pope may cease to be head of the Church. When the civil powers, which have succeeded the imperial, each in its respective territory, are no less absolute than it, they may take it away, if they judge it fit; for whatever power was granted by human authority, by the same may be revoked; and what the emperor could have done, each sovereign power now may do for itself.

An indefectible power cannot be settled by man; because

there is no power ever extant at one time greater than there is at another; so that whatever power one may raise, the other may demolish; there being no bounds whereby the present time may bind all posterity.

However, no human law can exempt any constitution from the providence of God; which at pleasure can dissolve whatever man hath framed. And if the Pope were divested of all adventitious power, obtained by human means, he would be left very bare; and hardly would take it worth his while to contend for jurisdiction.

8. However or whencesoever the Pope had his authority, yet it may be forfeited by defects and defaults incurred by him.

If the Pope doth encroach on the rights and liberties of others, usurping a lawless domination, beyond reason and measure, they may in their own defence be forced to reject him. and shake off his yoke.

If he will not be content to govern otherwise than by infringing the sacred laws, and trampling down the inviolable privileges of the churches, either granted by Christ, or established by the sanctions of general synods; he thereby deprivetb himself of all authority; because it cannot be admitted on tolerable terms, without greater wrong of many others, (whose right outweigheth his,) and without great mischief to the Church, the good of which is to be preferred before his private advantage.

This was the maxim of a great Pope, a great stickler for his own dignity; for when the bishop of Constantinople was advanced by a general synod above his ancient pitch of dignity, that Pope opposing him did say, that "whoever doth affect more than his due, doth lose that which properly belonged to him:"* the which rule, if true in regard to another's case, may be applied to the Pope; 'For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.'

On such a supposition of the papal encroachment, we may return his words on him; "It is too proud and immoderate a thing to stretch beyond one's bounds, and, in contempt of antiquity, to be willing to invade other men's right, and to oppose the primacies of so many metropolitans, on purpose to advance the dignity of one."†

"For the privileges of churches, being instituted by the canons of the holy Fathers, and fixed by the decrees of the

* P. Leo I. Ep. 54. † Ibid. 55.

venerable synod of Nice, cannot be plucked up by any wicked attempt, nor altered by any innovation."*

"Far be it from me, that I should in any church infringe the decrees of our ancestors made in favor of my fellow-priests; for I do myself injury, if I disturb the rights of my brethren."†

The Pope surely (according to any ground of Scripture, or tradition, or ancient law) hath no title to greater principality in the Church. than the Duke of Venice hath in that state: now if the Duke of Venice, in prejudice to the public right and liberty, should attempt to stretch his power to an absoluteness of command, or much beyond the bounds allowed him by the constitution of that commonwealth, he would thereby surely forfeit his supremacy, (such as it is,) and afford cause to the state of rejecting him: the like occasion would the Pope give to the Church by the like demeanour.

9. The Pope, by departing from the doctrine and practice of St. Peter, would forfeit his title of successor to him; for in such a case no succession in place or in name could preserve it; "The Popes themselves had swerved and degenerated from the example of Peter."‡

"They are not the sons of the saints who hold the places of the saints, but they that do their works."§ (Which place is rased out of St. Jerome.)

"They have not the inheritance of Peter who have not the faith of Peter, which they tear asunder by ungodly division."‖

So Gregory Nazianzen saith of Athanasius, that "he was successor of Mark, no less in piety than presidency; the which we must suppose to be properly succession;"¶ otherwise the Mufti of Constantinople is successor to St. Andrew, of St. Chrysostom, &c. the Mufti of Jerusalem to St. James.

If then the bishop of Rome, instead of teaching Christian doctrine, doth propagate errors contrary to it; if, instead of guiding into truth and godliness, he seduceth into falsehood and impiety; if, instead of declaring and pressing the laws of God, he delivereth and imposeth precepts opposite, prejudicial, destructive of God's laws; if, instead of promoting genuine piety, he doth (in some instances) violently oppose it; if, instead of maintaining true religion, he doth pervert and corrupt it by bold defalcations, by superstitious additions, by foul mix-

* P. Leo I. Ep. 55. † Greg. I. Epist. ii. 37.
‡ Plat. in Joh. x. (p. 275.)
§ Hieron. ad Heliod. apud Grat. Dist. xl. cap. 2.
‖ Ambr. de Pœn. i. 6. ¶ Greg. Naz. Or. 21.

tures and alloys; if he coineth new creeds, articles of faith, new scriptures, new sacraments, new rules of life, obtruding them on the consciences of Christians; if he conformeth the doctrines of Christianity to the interests of his pomp and profit, 'making gain godliness;' if he prescribe vain, profane, superstitious ways of worship, turning devotion into foppery and pageantry; if, instead of preserving order and peace, he fomenteth discords and factions in the Church, being a make-bait and incendiary among Christians; if he claimeth exorbitant power, and exerciseth oppression and tyrannical domination over his brethren, cursing and damning all that will not submit to his dictates and commands; if, instead of being a shepherd, he is a wolf, worrying and tearing the flock by cruel persecution: he by such behavior, *ipso facto*, depriveth himself of authority and office; he becometh thence no guide or pastor to any Christian; there doth in such case rest no obligation to hear or obey him; but rather to decline him, to discost from him, to reject and disclaim him.

This is the reason of the case; this the holy Scripture doth prescribe; this is according to the primitive doctrine, tradition, and practice of the Church. For,

10. In reason, the nature of any spiritual office consisting in instruction in truth and guidance in virtue toward attainment of salvation; if any man doth lead into pernicious error or impiety, he thereby ceaseth to be capable of such office: as a blind man, by being so, doth cease to be a guide; and much more he that declareth a will to seduce; for, "Who so blind as he that will not see?"

No man can be bound to "follow any one into the ditch;" or to obey any one in prejudice to his own salvation: 'to die in his iniquity.' Seeing God saith in such a case, *μάτην σέβονταί με*, 'In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the precepts of men.'

They themselves do acknowlege that heretics cease to be bishops; and so to be Popes. Indeed they cease to be Christians; for *ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος*, 'such a one is subverted.'

11. According to their principles, the Pope hath the same relation to other bishops and pastors of the Church, which they have to their people; he being pastor of pastors; but if any pastor should teach bad doctrine, or prescribe bad practice, his people may reject and disobey him; therefore in proportion the pastors may desert the Pope misguiding or misgoverning them. In such cases any inferior is exempted from obligation to comply with his superior, either truly or pretendedly such.

12. The case may be that we may not hold communion with the Pope, but may be obliged to shun him; in which case his authority doth fail, and no man is subject to him.

13. This is the doctrine of the Scripture. The high-priest and his fellows, under the Jewish economy, had no less authority than any Pope can now pretend unto; they did 'sit in the chair of Moses,' and therefore all their true doctrines and lawful directions the people were obliged to learn and observe; but their false doctrines and impious precepts they were bound to shun; and consequently to disclaim their authority, so far as employed in urging such doctrines and precepts; 'Ἄφετε αὐτοὺς, 'Let them alone,' saith our Saviour, 'they are blind leaders of the blind.' Under the Christian dispensation, the matter is no less clear; our Lord commandeth us 'to beware of false prophets;' and to 'see that no man deceive us:' although he wear the clothing of a sheep, or come under the name of a shepherd ('coming in his name—.') St. Paul informeth us that if 'an Apostle,' if 'an angel from heaven,' doth preach beside the old apostolical doctrine, (introducing any new gospel, or a divinity devised by himself) he is to be held accursed by us. He affirmeth that even the Apostles themselves were not 'lords of our faith,' nor might challenge any power inconsistent with the maintenance of Christian truth and piety; 'We,' saith he, 'can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth:' the which an ancient writer doth well apply to the Pope, saying, that he "could do nothing against the truth more than any of his fellow-priests could do:"* which St. Paul did in practice show, when he resisted St. Peter, 'declining from the truth of the gospel.' He chargeth that if any one doth ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, 'teach heterodoxies,' we should 'stand off from him;' that 'if any brother walketh disorderly, and not according to apostolical tradition, we should withdraw from him;' that if any one doth 'raise divisions and scandals beside the doctrines received from the Apostles, we should decline from him:' that we are 'to refuse any heretical person.' He telleth us that 'grievous wolves should come into the Church, not sparing the flock;' that 'from among Christians there should arise men speaking perverse things, to draw disciples after them:' but no man surely ought to follow, but to shun them.

These precepts and admonitions are general, without any respect or exception of persons great or small, pastor or layman: nay, they may in some respect more concern bishops than

* Fac. Hermian. ii. 6.

others; for that they declining from truth, are more dangerous and contagious.

14. The Fathers (in reference to this case) do clearly accord, both in their doctrine and practice. St. Cyprian telleth us that "a people obedient to the Lord's commandments, and fearing God, ought to separate itself from a sinful bishop;"* that is, from one guilty of such sins which unqualify him for Christian communion, or pastoral charge; and, "Let not," addeth he, "the common people flatter itself, as if it could be free from the contagion of guilt, if it communicate with a sinful bishop;"† whose irreligious doctrine or practice doth render him uncapable of communion; for "how (saith he otherwhere) can they preside over integrity and continence, if corruptions and the teaching of vices do begin to proceed from them?"‡

"They who reject the commandment of God, and labor to establish their own tradition, let them be strongly and stoutly refused and rejected by you."§

St. Chrysostom commenting on St. Paul's words, "If I, or an angel"—saith that St. Paul "meaneth to show, that dignity of persons is not to be regarded where truth is concerned;"‖ that "if one of the chief angels from heaven should corrupt the gospel, he were to be accursed;"¶ that "not only, if they shall speak things contrary, or overturn all, but if they preach any small matter beside the apostolical doctrine, altering the least point whatever, they are liable to an anathema."**

And otherwhere, very earnestly persuading his audience to render due respect and obedience to their bishop, he yet interposeth this exception, "If he hath a perverse opinion, although he be an angel, do not obey him; but if he teacheth right things, regard not his life, but his words."††

"Ecclesiastical judges, as men, are for the most part deceived."‡‡

"For neither are Catholic bishops to be assented to, if peradventure in any case they are mistaken, so as to hold any thing contrary to the canonical Scriptures of God."§§

"If there be any church which rejects the faith, and does not hold the fundamentals of the apostolical doctrine, it ought to be forsaken, lest it infect others with its heterodoxy."‖‖

* Cypr. Ep. 68. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid 62.
§ Cypr. Ep. 40. (p. 73.) ‖ Chrys. in Gal. i. 9.
¶ Ibid. i. 8. ** Ibid.
†† Chrys. in 2 Tim. Orat. 2. ‡‡ Aug. contr. Cresc. ii. 21.
§§ August. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 10.
‖‖ Ambr. in Luc. ix. (p. 85.)

If in such a case we must desert any church, then the Roman; if any church, then much more any bishop, particularly him of Rome.

This hath deen the doctrine of divers Popes.

"Which not only the apostolical prelate, but any other bishop may do, viz. discriminate and sever any men, and any place, from the Catholic communion, according to the rule of that fore-condemned heresy."*

"Faith is universal, common to all, and belongs, not only to clergymen, but also to laics, and even to all Christians."+

"Therefore the sheep which are committed to the cure of their pastor ought not to reprehend him, unless he swerve and go astray from the right faith."‡

15. That this was the current opinion, common practice doth show, there being so many instances of those who rejected their superiors, and withdrew from their communion, in case of their maintaining errors, or of their disorderly behavior; such practice having been approved by general and great synods, as also by divers Popes.

When Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, did introduce new and strange doctrine, "divers of his presbyters did rebuke him, and withdraw communion from him;"§ which proceeding is approved in the Ephesine synod.

Particularly Charisius did assert this proceeding in those remarkable words presented to that same synod; "It is the wish and desire of all well affected persons, to give always all due honor and reverence especially to their spiritual fathers and teachers: but if it should so happen that they who ought to teach, should instil unto those who are set under them such things concerning the faith as are offensive to the ears and hearts of all men, then of necessity the order must be inverted, and they who teach wrong doctrine must be rebuked of those who are their inferiors."‖

Pope Celestine I. in that case did commend the people of Constantinople, deserting their pastor; "Happy flock," said he, "to whom the Lord did afford to judge about its own pasture."¶

St. Jerome did presume to write very briskly and smartly in reproof of John, bishop of Jerusalem, in whose province he a simple presbyter did reside.

* P. Gelas. I. Ep. 4. + P. Nich. I. Ep. viii. p. 506.
‡ P. Joh. I. Ep. 1. (apud Bin. tom. iii. p. 812)
§ Conc. Eph. part. i. p. 220.
‖ Charis. in Conc. Eph. Act. vi. p. 358.
¶ Celest. I. in Conc. Eph. p. 190.

"Who makes a schism in the Church? we whose whole house in Bethlehem communicate with the Church, or thou who either believest aright, and proudly concealest the truth, or art of a wrong belief, and really makest a breach in the Church? Art thou only the Church? And is he who offendeth thee excluded from Christ?"*

Malchion, presbyter of Antioch, disputed against Paulus Samosatenus, his bishop.†

Beatus, presbyter, confuted his bishop, Elipandus of Toledo.

"But if the rector swerve from the faith, he is to be reproved by those who are under him."‡

16. The case is the same of the Pope; for if other bishops, who are reckoned successors of the Apostles, and vicars of Christ within their precinct; if other patriarchs, who sit in apostolical sees, and partake of a like extensive jurisdiction, by incurring heresy or schism, or committing notorious disorder and injustice, may be deprived of their authority, so that their subjects may be obliged to forsake them, then may the Pope lose his: for truth and piety are not affixed to the chair of Rome more than to any other; there is no ground of asserting any such privilege, either in holy Scripture or in old tradition; there can no promise be alleged for it, having any probable show, (that of *Oravi pro te* being a ridiculous pretence,) it cannot stand without a perpetual miracle; there is in fact no appearance of any such miracle; from the ordinary causes of great error and impiety (that is, ambition, avarice, sloth, luxury) the papal state is not exempt, yea, apparently, it is more subject to them than any other; all ages have testified and complained thereof.

17. Most eminent persons have in such cases withdrawn communion from the Pope; as otherwhere we have showed by divers instances.

18. The canon law itself doth admit the Pope may be judged if he be a heretic.—"Because he that is to judge all persons is to be judged of none, except he be found to be gone astray from the faith."§

The supposition doth imply the possibility; and therefore the case may be put that he is such, and then he doth (according to the more current doctrine ancient and modern) cease to be a bishop, yea a Christian; hence no obedience is due to him; yea no communion is to be held with him.

* Hier. Ep. lxi. cap. 16. Ep. lxii. † Hieron. in Catal.

‡ Isid. Hisp. de Offic. iii. 39.

§ Grat. Dist. xl. cap. 6. Vid. P. Innoc. III. apud Laun. contra Baron——.

19. This in fact was acknowleged by a great Pope, allowing the condemnation of Pope Honorius for good, because he was erroneous in point of faith: "For" (saith he, in that which is called the eighth synod) "although Honorius was anathematised after his death by the oriental bishops, it is yet well known that he was accused for heresy; for which alone it is lawful for inferiors to rise up against superiors."*

Now that the Pope (or papal succession) doth pervert the truth of Christian doctrine, in contradiction to the holy Scripture and primitive tradition; that he doth subvert the practice of Christian piety, in opposition to the divine commands; that he teacheth falsehoods, and maintaineth impieties, is notorious in many particulars, some whereof we shall touch.

We justly might charge him with all those extravagant doctrines and practices which the high-flying doctors do teach, and which the fierce zealots on occasion do act; for the whole succession of Popes of a long time hath most cherished and encouraged such folks, looking squintly on others, as not well affected to them; but we shall only touch those new and noxious or dangerous positions, which great synods, managed and confirmed by their authority, have defined, or which they themselves have magisterially decreed: or which are generally practised by their influence or countenance.

It is manifest that the Pope doth support and cherish as his special favorites, the ventors of wicked errors; such as those who teach the Pope's infallibility, his power over temporal princes, to cashier and depose them, to absolve subjects from their allegiance, the doctrine of equivocation, breach of faith with heretics, &c. the which doctrines are heretical, as inducing pernicious practice; whence whoever doth so much as communicate with the maintainers of them, according to the principles of ancient Christianity, are guilty of the same crimes.

The holy Scripture and Catholic antiquity do teach and enjoin us 'to worship and serve God alone,' our Creator; forbidding us to worship any creature, or fellow-servant; even not angels, "For I who am a creature will not endure to worship one like to me."†

But the Pope and his clients do teach and charge us to worship angels and dead men; yea even to venerate the relics and dead bodies of the saints.‡

The holy Scripture teacheth us to 'judge nothing' (about the

* Syn. VIII Act. vii. p. 963. † Bas. apud Sozom. vi. 16.
‡ Pii. IV. Profess. Fid. Conc. Trid.

present or future state of men, absolutely) 'before the time, until the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of hearts, and then each man shall have praise of God.'

But the Pope notoriously (in repugnance to those precepts, anticipating God's judgment, and arrogating to himself a knowlege requisite thereto) doth presume to determine the state of men, canonising them, declaring them to be saints, and proposing them to be worshipped; and on the other side, he damneth, curseth, and censureth his fellow-servants.

God in his law doth command us not 'to bow down ourselves unto any image,'* or worship 'the likeness of any thing in heaven or earth, or under the earth;' the which law (whether moral or positive) the gospel doth ratify and confirm, charging us to 'keep ourselves from idols' and 'to fly worshipping of idols,' that is, to observe the second commandment; the validity whereof the Fathers most expressly assert; and divers of them were so strict in their opinion about it, that they deemed it unlawful so much as to make any image.

But the Pope and his adherents (in point-blank opposition to divine law and primitive doctrine,) require us to fall down before and to worship images. "Moreover we decree that the images of saints be especially had and retained in churches, and that due honor and veneration be imparted to them- so that by those images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and fall down, we adore Christ, and venerate the saints whose likeness they bear."†

Neither is he satisfied to recommend and decree these unwarrantable venerations, but (with a horrible strange kind of uncharitableness and ferity) doth he "anathematise those who teach" or think "any thing opposite to his decrees concerning them;"‡ so that if the ancient Fathers should live now, they would live under this curse.

The holy Scripture, under condition of repentance and amendment of life, on recourse to God and trust in his mercy, through Jesus Christ our Saviour, doth offer and promise remission of sins, acceptance with God, justification and salvation; this is the tenor of the evangelical covenant; nor did the primitive Church know other terms.

But the Pope doth preach another doctrine, and requireth other terms, as necessary for remission of sins and salvation; for he hath decreed the confession of all and each mortal sin, which a man by recollection can remember, to a priest, to be

* Exod. xx. 4. † Conc. Trid. Sess. 25. ‡ Ibid.

necessary thereto; anathematising all who shall say the contrary; although the Fathers (particularly St. Chrysostom frequently) have affirmed the contrary.*

The which is plainly preaching another gospel, (forged by himself and his abettors,) as offering remission on other terms than God hath prescribed; and denying it on those which Christianity proposeth.

He teacheth that no sin is pardoned without absolution of a priest.

He requireth satisfaction imposed by a priest, besides repentance and new obedience, as necessary. Which is also another gospel.†

He dispenseth pardon of sin on condition of performances unnecessary and insufficient; such as undertaking "pilgrimages to the shrines of saints, visiting churches," making "war on infidels or heretics, contributing money, repeating prayers," undergoing "corporal penances," &c. Which is likewise to frame and publish another gospel.‡

These doctrines are highly presumptuous, and well may be reputed heretical.

God hath commanded that 'every soul should be subject to the higher powers temporal as to God's ministers;' so as to obey their laws, to submit to their judgments, to pay tribute to them. And the Fathers expound this law to the utmost extent and advantage: "If every soul, then yours; if any attempt to except you, he goes about to deceive you."§

But the Pope countermandeth, and exempteth all clergymen from those duties, by his canon law; excommunicating lay judges, who shall perform their office in regard to them. "Because indeed some lay persons constrain ecclesiastics, yea and bishops themselves, to appear before them, and to stand to their judgment, those that henceforth shall presume to do so, we decree that they shall be separate from the communion of the faithful."‖

The Scriptures do represent the king (or temporal sovereign) as supreme over his subjects, to whom all are obliged to yield special respect and obedience: the Fathers yield him the same place, above all, next to God; and subject to God alone: the ancient good Popes did acknowlege themselves servants and subjects to the Emperor.

* Sess. xiv. de Pœn. Can. 7. † Sess. xiv. Can. 4.
‡ Conc. Lat I. Can. 11. § Bern. Ep. 42.
‖ Bell. de Cler. cap. 1. Conc. Lat. III. Can. 14. Ibid. II. 15. Steph. VI. Ep. 1. (tom. i. p. 130.)

But later Popes, like the man of sin in St. Paul, have advanced themselves above all civil power; claiming to themselves a supereminency, not only of rank, but of power, over all Christian princes; even to depose them. "Christ has committed the rights both of terrestrial and celestial government to that blessed man who bears the keys of eternal life."*

"If the secular power be believers, God would have them subject to the priests of the Church—Christian emperors ought to submit, and not prefer the execution of their laws to the rulers of the Church."†

God by indispensable law hath obliged us to retain our obedience to the king, even Pagan; charging us under pain of damnation to be subject to him, and not to resist him—

But the Pope is ready on occasion to discharge subjects from that obligation, to absolve them from their solemn oaths of allegiance, to encourage insurrection against him, to prohibit obedience.—"We observing the decrees of our holy predecessors, by our apostolical authority absolve those from their oath who were bound by their fealty and oath to excommunicated persons: and we forbid them by all means that they yield them no allegiance, till they come and make satisfaction."‡

Thus doth he teach and prescribe rebellion, perjury; together with all the murders and rapines consequent on them: which is a far greater heresy, than if he should teach adultery, murder, or theft to be lawful. "For they are enjoined by no authority to perform the allegiance which they have sworn to a Christian prince, who is an adversary to God and his saints, and contemns their commands."§

Not only the holy Scripture, but common sense doth show it to be an enormous presumption to obtrude for the inspirations, oracles, and dictates of God, any writings or propositions, which are not really such.

This the Pope doth notoriously, charging us to admit divers writings (which the greatest part of learned men in all ages have refused for such) as sacred and canonical; anathematising all those who do not hold each of them for such:¶ even as they are extant in a translation, not very exact, and framed partly out of Hebrew, partly out of Greek, on divers accounts liable to mistake; as its author St. Jerome doth avow.

* P. Nich. II. apud Grat. Dist. xxii. cap. 1. Greg. VII. Ep. viii. 21.

† P. Joh. VIII. apud Grat. Dist. xcvi. cap. 11.

‡ Greg. VII. in Syn. Rom. Grat. Caus. xv. qu. 6. cap. 4.

§ P. Urb. II. apud Grat. Caus. xv. qu. 6. cap. 5.

¶ Conc. Trid. Sess. 4.

According to which decree, all who consent with St. Jerome, St. Austin, St. Athanasius, &c. with common sense, with the author of the second of Maccabees himself, must incur a curse. What can be more uncharitable, more unjust, more silly, than such a definition?

He pretendeth to infallibility, or encourageth them who attribute it to him; which is a continual enthusiasm, and profane bold imposture.

The Scripture doth avow a singular reverence due to itself, as containing the oracles of God —.

But the Pope doth obtrude the oral traditions of his church (divers of which evidently are new, dubious, vain—) to be worshipped with equal reverence as the holy Scripture. "And also receives and venerates, with the like pious respect and reverence, the traditions themselves—which have been preserved by continual succession in the Catholic Church."*

Among which traditions they reckon all the tricks and trumpery of their mass service; together with all their new notions about purgatory, extreme unction, &c. "He also used several ceremonies, as mystical benediction, lights, incensings, garments, and many other such things, from apostolical discipline and tradition."†

The Scriptures affirm themselves to be written for common instruction, comfort, edification in all piety; they do therefore recommend themselves to be studied and searched by all people; as the best and surest means of attaining knowlege and finding truth. The Fathers also do much exhort all people (even women and girls) constantly to read, and diligently to study the Scriptures.

But the Pope doth keep them from the people locked up in languages not understood by them;‡ prohibiting translations of them to be made or used. The Scripture teacheth, and common sense showeth, and the Fathers do assert, (nothing indeed more frequently or more plainly,) that all necessary points of faith and good morality are with sufficient evidence couched in holy Scripture; so that a 'a man of God,' or pious men, may

* Syn. Trid. Sess. 4.

† Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii. cap. 5. 11. de sacrif. Miss.

‡ N. P. Pius IV. did authorise certain rules for prohibition and permission of books; in which it is permitted to bishops to grant a faculty of reading the Scriptures translated——but to this rule there is added an observation, that this power was taken from bishops by command of the Roman Universal Inquisition. Ind. Lib. Prohib. a Clem. VIII.

thence 'be perfectly furnished to every work;' but they contrariwise blaspheme the Scriptures, as obscure, dangerous, &c.

Common sense dictateth that devotions should be performed with understanding and affection; and that consequently they should be in a known tongue: and St. Paul expressly teacheth that it is requisite for private and public edification; "From this doctrine of Paul it appears that it is better for the edification of the Church, that public prayers, which are said in the audience of the people, should be said in a tongue common to the clergy and the people, than that they should be said in Latin."*

All ancient churches did accordingly practise; and most others do so, beside those which the Pope doth ride.

But the Pope will not have it so, requiring the public liturgy to be celebrated in an unknown tongue; and that most Christians shall say their devotions like parrots. He anathematizeth those "who think the mass should be celebrated in a vulgar tongue;"† that is, all those who are in their right wits, and think it fit to follow the practice of the ancient Church.

The holy Scripture teacheth us that there is but one head of the Church; and the Fathers do avow no other (as we have otherwhere showed.)

But the Pope assumeth to himself the headship of the Church, affirming all "power and authority to be derived from him into the subject members of the Church."‡

"We decree that the Roman Pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church."§

The Scripture declareth that God did institute marriage for remedy of incontinency and prevention of sin; forbidding the use of it to none, who should think it needful or convenient for them; reckoning the prohibition of it among heretical doctrines; implying it to be imposing a snare on men.

But the Pope and his complices do prohibit it to whole orders of men, (priests, &c.) engaging them into dangerous vows.‖

Our Lord forbiddeth any marriage lawfully contracted to be dissolved, otherwise than in case of adultery.

But the Pope commandeth priests married to be divorced. "And that marriages contracted by such persons should be dissolved."¶

* Cajet. in 1. Cor. xiv. † Sess. xxii. Can. 9.
‡ P. Pius II. in Bull. Retract. § Defin. Syn. Flor.
‖ Vid. tom. vii. Conc. p. 465. Syn. Trid. Sess. xxiv. de matr. Can. 9.
¶ Conc. Lat. I. cap. 21. Lat. II. Trid. Sess. xxiv. Can. 9.——

He dissolveth matrimony agreed, by the profession of monkery of one of the espoused. "If any shall say, that matrimony confirmed, not consummate, is not dissolved by the solemn profession of religion of either party, let him be anathema."*

Our Saviour did institute and enjoin us (under pain of damnation, if we should wilfully transgress his order) to eat of his body, and drink of his blood, in participation of the holy Supper.

The Fathers did accordingly practise, with the whole Church, till late times.

But notwithstanding Christ's institution,† (as they express it,) papal synods do prohibit all laymen, and priests not celebrating to partake of Christ's blood; so maiming and perverting our Lord's institution: "and yet they decline to drink the blood of our redemption."‡

In defence of which practice, they confound body and blood; and under a curse would oblige us to believe that one kind doth contain the other; or that a part doth contain the whole.§

Whereas our Lord saith, that 'whoso eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood hath eternal life;' and consequently supposeth that bad men do not partake of his body and blood; yet they condemn this assertion under a curse.‖

The holy Scripture, and the Fathers after it, commonly do call the elements of the Eucharist, after consecration, bread and wine; affirming them to retain their nature.¶

But the Popish cabal anathematizeth those who say "that bread and wine do then remain."

"If any shall say, that in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of bread and wine remain—let him be anathema."**

The nature of the Lord's Supper doth imply communion and company; but they forbid any man to say that a priest may not communicate alone; so establishing the belief of nonsense and contradiction.

* Sess. xxiv. Can. 6. † Conc. Const. Sess. xiii.

‡ This Pope Leo I. condemneth. De Quadr. Serm. iv. (p. 38.) Sanguinem redemptionis nostræ haurire declinant——.

P. Gelasius calleth the division of the sacrament a grand sacrilege. Gratian. in De Consecr. Dist. ii. cap. 12.

§ Conc. Trid. Sess. xxi. Can. 3. Sess. xiii. Can. 3.

‖ Trid. Conc. Sess. xiii. cap. 8. Can. 4.——

¶ Theod. Gelas.——

** Trid. Conc. de Euch. Sess. xiii. Can. 2. Sess. xxii. de sacr. Miss. Can. 8. Sess. xiii. Can. 8.

The holy Scripture teacheth us that our Lord hath departed, and is absent from us in body; until that he shall come to judge, which is called his presence; that heaven, whither he ascended, and where he sitteth at God's right hand, must 'hold him till the times of the restitution of all things.'

But the Pope with his Lateran and Tridentine complices draw him down from heaven, and make him corporally present every day, in numberless places here.

The Scripture teacheth us that our Lord is a man, 'perfectly like to us in all things.'

But the Pope and his adherents make him extremely different from us, as having a body at once present in innumerable places; insensible, &c. divested of the properties of our body; thereby destroying his human nature, and in effect agreeing with Eutyches, Apollinarius, and other such pestilent heretics.

The Scripture representeth him born once for us; but they affirm him every day made by a priest, uttering the words of consecration; as if that which before did exist could be made; as if a man could make his Maker.

The Scripture teacheth that our Lord was once offered for expiation of our sins; but they pretend every day to offer him up as a propitiatory sacrifice.

These devices, without other foundation than a figurative expression, (which they resolve to expound in a proper sense, although even in that very matter divers figurative expressions are used, as they cannot but acknowlege,) they with all violence and fierceness obtrude on the belief as one of the most necessary and fundamental articles of the Christian religion.

The Scripture teacheth us humbly to acknowlege the rewards assigned by God to be gratuitous and free; and that we, 'after we have done all, must acknowlege ourselves unprofitable servants.'

But the Papists curse those who, although out of humility and modesty, will not acknowlege the good works of justified persons to be truly meritorious; "deserving the increase of grace, eternal life, and augmentation of glory:"* so forcing us to use saucy words and phrases, if not impious in their sense.

The Scripture teacheth one Church diffused over the whole world; whereof each part is bound to maintain charity, peace, and communion with the rest, on brotherly terms.

But the Romanists arrogate to themselves the name and privilege of the only Church; condemning all other churches

* Sess. vi. de Justif. Can. 32.

besides their own, and censuring all for apostatical who do not adhere to them, or submit to their yoke; just like the Donatists, who said that "the world had apostatised,"* excepting those who on their own terms did communicate with them; only the communion of Donatus remained the true Church.

The holy Scripture biddeth us take care of persons pretending to extraordinary inspirations; charging on the Holy Spirit their own conceits and devices.

Such have been their synods, boldly fathering their decrees on God's Spirit—. And their Pope is infallible, by virtue of inspiration communicated to him, when he pleaseth to set himself right in his chair. Whence we may take them for bodies of enthusiasts and fanatics: the difference only is, that other enthusiasts pretend singly, they conjunctly and by conspiracy. Others pretend it in their own direction and defence, these impose their dreams on the whole Church.

If they say that God hath promised his Spirit to his Church, it is true; but he hath no less plainly and frequently promised it to single Christians, who should seek it earnestly of him.

The ancient Fathers could in the Scriptures hardly discern more than two sacraments, or mysterious rites of our religion, by positive law and institution of our Saviour to be practised.†

But the Popes have devised others, and under uncharitable curses propound them to be professed for such; affirming them to confer grace by the bare performance of them ‡

Every clergyman and monk is bound by Pius IV. to profess "there are just seven of them;"§ and the Tridentine synod "anathematizeth all those, who do say there are more or fewer;"‖ although the ancients did never hit on that number.

"But these our sacraments both contain grace, and also confer it on those who worthily receive them."¶

They require men to believe under a curse that each of those were instituted of Christ, and confer grace by the bare performance.

Particularly, they curse those who do not hold "matrimony for a sacrament, instituted by Christ, and conferring grace."** What can be more ridiculous than to say that marriage was instituted by Christ, or that it doth confer grace?

* Aug. de Unit. 12——.
† Aug. Doctr. Christ. Ep. ad Jen.
‡ Bell. de Sacr. ii. 25.
§ Bulla Pii IV.
‖ Syn. Trid. Sess. vii. Can. 1.
¶ P. Eug. in Instr. Arm. Ibid. Can. 8.
** Sess. xxiv. Can. 1.

Yet with another anathema they prefer virginity before it: and why, forsooth, is not that another sacrament? And then they must be comparing the worth of these sacraments, condemning those heavily, who may conceive them equal, as being divine institutions.

"If any shall say that these seven sacraments are so equal one to another, that one is in no respect of more worth than another, let him be anathema."*

The first, as it seemeth, who reckoned the sacraments to be seven, was Peter Lombard; whom the schoolmen did follow; and Pope Eugenius IV. followed them; and afterward the Trent men formed it into an article backed with an anathema.†

On which rash and peremptory sentence touching all ancient divines, we may note;

1. Is it not strange that an article of faith should be formed on an ambiguous word, or a term of art, used with great variety?

2. Is it not strange to define a point whereof it is most plain that the Fathers were ignorant, wherein they never did agree or resolve any thing?

3. Yea, whereof they speak variously.

4. Is it not odd and extravagant to damn or curse people for a point of so little consideration or certainty?

5. Is it not intolerable arrogance and presumption to define, nay, indeed, to make an article of faith, without any manner of ground or color of authority either from Scripture or the tradition of the ancient Fathers?‡

The holy Scripture forbiddeth us 'to call any man master on earth,' or absolutely to subject our faith to the dictates of any man; it teacheth us that the Apostles themselves are 'not lords of our faith,' so as to oblige us to believe their own inventions; it forbiddeth us to swallow whole the doctrines and precepts of men, without examination of them. It forbiddeth us to admit 'various and strange doctrines.'

But the Pope and Roman church exact from us a submission to their dictates, admitting them for true, without any farther inquiry or discussion, barely on his authority. "They who are provided of any benefices whatever, having cure of souls, let them promise and swear obedience to the Roman church."§

They require of us without doubt to believe, to profess, to

* Sess. vii. Can. 3.

† P. Eug. in Instr. Arm. Vid. de Sacram. ii. 25.

‡ Bell. de Sacr. ii. 24.

§ Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiv. cap. 12. de Ref.

assert innumerable propositions, divers of them new and strange, nowise deducible from Scripture or apostolical tradition, the very terms of them being certainly unknown to the primitive Church, devised by human subtilty, curiosity, contentiousness —divers of them being (in all appearance, to the judgment of common sense) uncertain, obscure, and intricate; divers of them bold and fierce; divers of them frivolous and vain; divers of them palpably false. Namely, all such propositions, as have been taught by their great juntos, allowed by the Pope, especially that of Trent.

"Moreover all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and œcumenical councils, and especially by the holy synod of Trent, I undoubtedly receive and profess; and also all things contrary thereunto, and all heresies whatsoever condemned and rejected, and anathematised by the Church, I in like manner do condemn, reject, and anathematise——. This is the true Catholic faith, out of which there can be no salvation."*

This usurpation on the consciences of Christians (none like whereto was ever known in the world) they prosecute with most uncharitable censures; cursing and damning all who do not in heart and profession submit to them, obliging all their consorts to join therein, against all charity and prudence.

The Scripture enjoineth us to bear with those who are weak in faith, and err in doubtful or disputable matters.

But the Popes, with cruel uncharitableness, not only do censure all that cannot assent to their devices, which they obtrude as articles of faith; but sorely persecute them with all sorts of punishments; even with death itself; a practice inconsistent with Christian meekness, with equity, with reason; and of which the Fathers have expressed the greatest detestation.

"They have unwoven and altered all theology from head to foot, and of divine have made it sophistical."†

The Pope, with his pack of mercenary clients at Trent, did indeed establish a scholastical or sophistical, rather than a Christian theology; framing points, devised by the idle wits of latter times, into definitions and peremptory conclusions, backed with curses and censures: concerning which conclusions it is evident,

That the Apostles themselves would not be able to understand many of them.‡

* P. Pii IV. profess. † Erasm. præf. ad Hieron.

‡ Formaliter justos. Sess. vi. Can. 10. Ex opere operato. Sess. vii. Can. 8.

That the ancient Fathers did never think any thing about them.

That divers of them consist in application of artificial terms and phrases devised by human subtilty.

That divers of them are in their own nature disputable; were before disputed by wise men; and will ever be disputed by those who freely use their judgment.

That there was no need of defining many of them.

That they blindly lay about them, condemning and cursing they know not who, Fathers, schoolmen, divines, &c. who have expressly affirmed points so damned by them.

That many truths are uncharitably backed with curses, which disparageth them; (seeing a man may err pardonably—πολλὰ γὰρ πταίομεν ἅπαντες,) 'in many things we offend all.'

For instance, what need was there of defining, what need of cursing those, who think concupiscence 'to be truly and properly sin,' on St. Paul's authority calling it so?

That "Adam presently on his transgression did lose the sanctity and justice in which he was constituted?"*

What need of cursing those who say that men are justified 'by the sole remission of sins,'† according to St. Paul's notion, and use of the word justification?

What need of cursing those, who say "the grace of God, by which we are justified, is only the favor of God;"‡ whereas it is plain enough that God's grace there in St. Paul doth signify nothing else, applied to that case?

Or that faith is "nothing else but a reliance in God's mercy, remitting sins for Christ;"§ seeing it is plain that St. Paul doth by faith chiefly mean the belief of that principal point of the gospel?

Or that good works "do not cause an increase of justification;"‖ seeing St. Paul doth exclude justification by works; and it is a free work of God—uncapable of degrees?

Or that after remission of sin in justification, "a guilt of paying temporal pain doth abide?"¶

Or that a man cannot 'by his works merit increase of grace, and glory, and eternal life;'** seeing a man is not to be blamed, who doth dislike the use of so saucy a word; the which divers good men have disclaimed?

††What need of cursing those who do not take the sacraments

* Sess. v. Can. 1. † Sess. vi. Can. 11. ‡ Ibid.
§ Sess. vi. Can. 12. ‖ Ibid. 24.
¶ Sess. vi. Can. 30. Sess. xiv. de pœnit. Can. 15.
** Sess. vi. Can. 32. †† Sess. vii. Can. 1.

to be precisely seven? or who conceive that some one of their seven may not be truly and properly a sacrament: seeing the word sacrament is ambiguous, and by the Fathers applied to divers other things, and defined generally by St. Austin, *signum rei sacræ;* and that before Peter Lombard ever did mention that number?

What need of damning those, who do conceive the sacraments equal in dignity?*

What need of defining, that sacraments do confer grace *ex opere operato?* which is an obscure scholastical phrase.†

What need of cursing those who say, that "character is not impressed in the soul of those who take baptism, confirmation, or orders;"‡ seeing what this character is, (or this spiritual and indelible mark,§) they do not themselves well understand or agree?

What need of cursing those, who do not think that the validity of sacraments (and consequently the assurance of our being Christians) dependeth on the intention of the minister?‖

What need of cursing those, who think that a pastor of the Church may change the ceremonies of administering the sacraments; seeing St. Cyprian often teacheth that every pastor hath full authority in such cases within his own precinct?¶

What need of defining the second book of Maccabees to be canonical, against the common opinion of the Fathers, (most expressly of St. Austin himself,) of the most learned in all ages, of Pope Gelasius himself, (*in Decret.*) which the author himself (calling his work an epitome, and asking pardon for his errors) disclaimeth, and which common sense therefore disclaimeth?**

Their new creed of Pius IV. containeth these novelties and heterodoxies. 1. Seven sacraments. 2. Trent doctrine of justification and original sin. 3. Propitiatory sacrifice of the mass. 4. Transubstantiation. 5. Communicating under one kind. 6. Purgatory. 7. Invocation of saints. 8. Veneration of relics 9. Worship of images. 10. The Roman church to be the mother and mistress of all churches. 11. Swearing obedience to the Pope. 12. Receiving the decrees of all synods, and of Trent.

* Sess. vii. Can. 3. † Ibid. 8. ‡ Ibid. 9.
§ Ibid. ‖ Ibid. 11. ¶ Ibid. 13. ** Sess. iv.

A

DISCOURSE

CONCERNING THE

UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

Non habet charitatem Dei, qui Ecclesiæ non diligit unitatem.
AUG. DE BAPT. 3.

SUMMARY OF A DISCOURSE

ON THE

UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

THE *Unity of the Church* is not a point solely speculative and remote from practice: many duties depend on a true notion of it. St. Paul's exhortation to the Ephesians on this topic: he begins with the *unity* of the *body*, that is, of the Christian Church; concerning which unity is the present discourse.

To clear this point it is first stated what the Church is, since the word church in itself is ambiguous: for sometimes an assembly of Christians is called a church; sometimes a particular society of Christians; sometimes a collection of particular societies: also the society of those who undertake the evangelical covenant, in distinction to all other religions, particularly to the *synagogue;* moreover the whole body of God's people that is, hath been, or shall be, sincere believers in Christ, &c. is called the Church.

Of these acceptations, the two latter alone come under present consideration; for St. Paul did not speak of any particular society. And to determine the case between these two it must be observed, that to the latter of these all the glorious titles and excellent privileges attributed to the Church in holy Scripture do agree: this shown.

It is also shown that to this Church that unity does properly appertain which is described in holy writ.

But moreover the same titles, and particularly the same unity, does in some order and measure belong, and is attributed to the universal visible Church sojourning on earth: this shown.

And of this Church (under due reference to the other) the question is, wherein the *unity* of it consists; or on what grounds it is called *one;* since it comprises so many persons, societies, and nations?

For the resolution of this question, it is first considered on what accounts and grounds a community of men may be called *one.*

It is next shown that on divers such accounts the Catholic church may be said to be *one.*

I. It is evident that the Church is one by consent in faith and opinion concerning all principal matters of doctrine, &c. to *teach us which the grace of God did appear:* this shown.

In regard to this union in faith peculiarly the body of Christians adhering to it was called the Catholic church, &c. Hence in practice whoever differed from the common faith was rejected as an apostate.

There are points of less moment, and more obscurely delivered, in which Christians may differ without breach of unity. The faith of Christians at first consisted in but few points.

II. It is evident that all Christians are united by the bands of mutual charity and good will. This is the command of Christ. Whoever highly offends against charity, separates himself from Christ's body, &c. The most notorious violators of charity therefore, as causing dissensions in the Church, were rejected by the Fathers: such were the Novatians, Donatists, &c.

III. All Christians are united by spiritual cognation and alliance, &c.

IV. The whole Christian Church is *one* by its incorporation into the mystical body of Christ, &c.

Hence a habit of disobedience severs a man from this body: hence also St. Austin denies wicked persons to be in the Church.

V. All Christians are linked together in peaceable concord and confederacy; so that they are bound to live in good correspondence; to communicate in works of piety and devotion; to defend and promote the common interest of their religion. This shown in general.

But particularly all Christians should assist one another in the

common defence of truth, piety, and peace, in the propagation of the faith, &c. Hence they should be ready to declare against any heresy or bad doctrine: this especially the duty of pastors; thus the bishops of several churches met to suppress the heresy of P. Samosatenus. This was the ground of most synods, &c.

All Christians should be ready to admit one another to conjunction in good offices, prayer, pious conference, &c. to compose dissensions; to hold friendly correspondence; to apply to each other for advice, countenance, or relief: instances given.

VI. Now because in these things the pastors have the chief hand, and act in behalf of their churches, therefore is the Christian church united also by their consent in doctrine, agreement in peace, intercourse, and concurrence to preserve truth and charity: this shown.

VII. All Christian churches are *one* by a specifical unity of discipline, resembling one another in ecclesiastical administrations, which are regulated by the indispensable sanctions and institutions of their sovereign: this explained.

VIII. It is expedient that all churches should conform to each other in great matters of prudential discipline, though not instituted or prescribed by God; for this is a means of preserving peace and harmony. Difference of practice alienates affection, especially in the common people. Decree of the synod of Nice on this point. The Church therein is like the world: kinds of unity which agree with both explained.

But the question is whether the Church is also necessarily, by the design and appointment of God, to be, in way of external policy, under one singular government or jurisdiction, so as a kingdom is under one monarch, &c.

That the Church is capable of such an union is not the point in controversy; or that it was nearly so, when in a manner all Christendom consisted of subjects of the Roman empire. But that such an union was necessary, or instituted by Christ cannot be granted: divers reasons are assigned for this denial.

1. The holy Scripture no where expresses or intimates such a kind of unity.

2. By the apostolical history it may appear that the Apostles, in founding Christianity, took no care to establish such.

3. The Fathers, in their set treatises, make it to consist only in these unions of faith, charity, and peace, which have been described: instances quoted.

4. The constitution of such an unity involves the vesting of some person or persons with sovereign authority, subordinate to our Lord.

It is shown that no such authority was instituted by our Saviour or his Apostles: also that there are various reasonable presumptions against it.

5. The primitive state of the Church did not well comport with such an unity: this shown.

6. This *αὐτονομία* and liberty of Churches shown to have long continued in practice inviolate, though tempered and modelled in accommodation to circumstances.

7. This political unity does not well accord with the nature and genius of the evangelical dispensation: this shown; and the anti-evangelical state of the Papacy explained.

8. The union of the whole Church in one body, under one sovereign government, would be inconvenient, prejudicial to the designs of Christianity, and to the welfare of mankind in many respects.

9. Such an union would be of small use, or would do little good, in balance to the great mischiefs and inconveniences which it would produce: this explained.

10. Such a connexion of churches is not needful or expedient to Christianity.

11. The Church in the Scripture sense hath ever continued *one*, and will so continue, without it.

12. It is a fact that churches which have not been thus united, have yet continued Catholic and Christian.

13. The reasons alleged in proof of such an unity are insufficient and inconclusive.

The arguments of an eminent divine in favor of it, proposed and answered.

I. On the name of *Church* attributed to the whole body of Christians.

II. On our creeds importing the belief of such an unity.

III. On the delivery of one rule of faith to all churches by the Apostles, celebrated in baptism, which was a necessary condition to admission, and continuance in the Church.

IV. On God having granted to the Church certain powers and rights, *jure majestatis;* as the power of the keys, &c.

V. On all churches being tied to observe the same laws or rules of practice, the same orders of discipline and customs.

VI. On the Jewish Church being one corporation; to which the Christian Church should correspond.

VII. On all ecclesiastical power being derived from the same source, by succession from the Apostles; wherefore the Church was one political body.

VIII. On the power which all churches exercised of excommunication, exclusion of heretics, &c.

IX. On their maintaining intercourse and commerce with each other by various synodical epistles.

X. On the effectual preservation of unity in the primitive Church, alleged as an argument of its being united in one government.

XI. On the relief afforded by one church to another; which supposes the same government.

XII. On the use of Councils, as an argument of this union.

It may be objected that this doctrine favors the conceits of the Independents, concerning ecclesiastical discipline.

To this an answer is given in the negative.

Reasons for the same. 1. Every church is bound to observe the institutions of Christ, and that sort of government which the Apostles ordained, of bishops, priests, and people. 2. The expediency of a combination of particular churches under just authority is avowed. 3. Such bodies having been so established, every man is bound to uphold them. 4. It is acknowleged a crime to disturb them factiously. 5. It is conceived fit that every people under one prince should be united in the bands of ecclesiastical polity. 6. It is supposed that all churches are

obliged to hold a friendly communion. 7. As also to comply with lawful decrees of synods, &c.

Divers corollaries deduced from the foregoing premises, whence the clamors of the Romanists against other churches are shown to be groundless; the injustice of their claims, the nature of schism, and the conduct to be pursued with respect to the Roman church are pointed out; &c.

A DISCOURSE

CONCERNING THE

UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

EPHESIANS, CHAP. IV.—VERSE 4.

One body, and one spirit.

THE unity of the Church is a point which may seem somewhat speculative, and remote from practice: but in right judgments it is otherwise; many duties depending on a true notion and consideration of it; so that from ignorance or mistake about it we may incur divers offences or omissions of duty; hence in holy Scripture it is often proposed as a considerable point, and useful to practice.

And if ever the consideration of it were needful, it is so now, when the Church is so rent with dissensions, for our satisfaction and direction about the questions and cases debated in Christendom; for on the explication of it, or the true resolution wherein it doth consist, the controversies about "church-government, heresy, schism, liberty of conscience," and by consequence many others, do depend; yea, indeed, all others are by some parties made to depend thereon.

St. Paul, exhorting the Ephesians, his disciples, to the maintenance of charity and peace among themselves, doth for inducement to that practice represent the unity and community of those things which jointly did appertain to them as Christians: the unity of that body whereof they were members; of that spirit which did animate and act them; of that hope to which they were called; of that Lord whom they all did worship and serve; of that faith which they did profess; of that baptism whereby they were admitted into the same state of duties, of

rights, of privileges; of that one God and universal Father, to whom they had all the same relations.

He beginneth with the unity of the body; that is, of the Christian Church; concerning which unity, what it is, and wherein it doth consist, I mean now to discourse.

In order to clearing which point, we must first state what the Church is of which we discourse: for the word Church is ambiguous, having both in holy Scripture and common use divers senses somewhat different. For,

1. Sometimes any assembly or company of Christians is called a church: as when mention is made of the church in such a house; (whence Tertullian saith, "Where there are three, even laics, there is a church."*)

2. Sometimes a particular society of Christians, living in spiritual communion, and under discipline; as when the church at such a town; the churches of such a province; the churches; all the churches, are mentioned: according to which notions St. Cyprian saith that there is a church, where there is "a people united to a priest, and a flock adhering to their shepherd:"† and so Ignatius saith, "that without the orders of the clergy a church is not called."‡

2. A larger collection of divers particular societies combined together in order, under direction and influence of a common government, or of persons acting in the public behalf, is termed a church: as the church of Antioch, of Corinth, of Jerusalem, &c. each of which at first probably might consist of divers congregations, having dependences of less towns annexed to them; all being united under the care of the bishop and presbytery of those places; but however, soon after the Apostles' times, it is certain that such collections were, and were named churches.

4. The society of those who at present or in course of time profess the faith and gospel of Christ, and undertake the evangelical covenant, in distinction to all other religions; particularly to that of the Jews; which is called the synagogue.

5. The whole body of God's people that is, ever hath been, or ever shall be, from the beginning of the world to the consummation thereof, who having (formally or virtually) believed in Christ, and sincerely obeyed God's laws, shall finally, by the meritorious performances and sufferings of Christ, be saved, is called the Church.

Of these acceptions the two latter do only come under pre-

* Tert. de Exh. Cast. cap. 7.
† Cypr. Ep. 69. ‡ Ignat. ad Tral.

sent consideration; it being plain that St. Paul doth not speak of any one particular or present society; but of all at all times who have relation to the same Lord, faith, hope, sacraments, &c.

Wherefore, to determine the case between these two, we must observe that to the latter of these (that is, to the Catholic society of true believers and faithful servants of Christ, diffused through all ages, dispersed through all countries, whereof part doth sojourn on earth, part doth reside in heaven, part is not yet extant; but all whereof is described in the register of divine preordination, and shall be re-collected at the resurrection of the just; that, I say, to this Church) especially all the glorious titles and excellent privileges attributed to the Church in holy Scripture do agree.

This is the body of Christ, whereof he is the head and Saviour.

This is the spouse and wife of Christ; whereof he is the bridegroom and husband.

This is the house of God; whereof our Lord is the master; which is 'built on a rock, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

This is 'the city of God; the new, the holy, the heavenly Jerusalem, the mother of us all.'

This is the 'Sion, which the Lord hath chosen, which he hath desired for his habitation,' where he hath resolved to 'place his rest and residence for ever.'

This is 'the mountain of the Lord, seated above all mountains, unto which all nations shall flow.'

This is 'the elect generation, royal priesthood, holy nation, peculiar people.'

This is 'the general assembly, and Church of the firstborn, who are enrolled in heaven.'

This is 'the Church which God hath purchased with his own blood;' and, 'for which Christ hath delivered himself, that he might sanctify it, and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it might be holy and unblemished.'

To this Church, as those high elogies most properly do appertain, so that unity which is often attributed to the Church doth peculiarly belong thereto.

This is that 'one body, into which we are all baptised by one Spirit;' which is 'knit together, and compacted of parts affording mutual aid, and supply to its nourishment and increase;' the members whereof do hold a mutual sympathy and

complacence; which is joined to one Head, deriving sense and motion from it; which is enlivened and moved by one Spirit.

This is that 'one spiritual house,' reared 'on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone: in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.'

This is that 'one family of God,' whereof Christ is the οἰκοδεσπότης, whence good Christians are οἰκεῖοι Θεοῦ.

This is that one city or corporation, endued with an ample charter and noble privileges, in regard to which St. Paul saith we are συμπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων, (fellow-citizens of the saints,) and that our πολίτευμα (our civil state and capacity) is in heaven, or that we are citizens thereof.

That one holy nation, and peculiar people, (the spiritual Israel,) subject to the same government and law, (that which is called the kingdom of heaven;) enjoying the same franchises and privileges; following the same customs and fashions; using the same conversation and language; whereof Jesus Christ is the Lord and King.

This is the 'one flock, under one shepherd.'

This is the society of those for whom Christ did pray that they might 'be all one.'

It is true that divers of these characters are expressed to relate to the Church after Christ; but they may be allowed to extend to all the faithful servants of God before, who in effect were Christians, being saved on the same account; and therefore did belong to the same body.*

To this Church in a more special and eminent manner all those titles, and particularly that of unity, are ascribed; but the same also in some order and measure do belong and are attributed to the universal Church sojourning on earth.

For because this visible Church doth enfold the other, (as one mass doth contain the good ore and base alloy; as one floor the corn and the chaff; as one field the wheat and the tares; as one net the choice fish and the refuse; as one fold the sheep and the goats; as one tree the living and the dry branches;) because this society is designed to be in reality what the other is in appearance, the same with the other; because therefore presumptively every member of this doth pass for a member of the other, (the time of distinction and separation not being yet come;) because this in its profession of truth, in its sacrifices of devotion, in its practice of service

* Aug. in Psal. 128. Greg. Mag. Epist. 24.

and duty to God doth communicate with that; therefore commonly the titles and attributes of the one are imparted to the other.

'All,' saith St. Paul, 'are not Israel who are of Israel;' nor 'is he a Jew that is one outwardly;' yet in regard to the conjunction of the rest with the faithful Israelites, because of external consent in the same profession, and conspiring in the same services, all the congregation of Israel is styled 'a holy nation' and 'peculiar people.'*

So likewise do the Apostles speak to all members of the Church, as to elect and holy persons, unto whom all the privileges of Christianity do belong; although really hypocrites and bad men "do not belong to the Church," nor are "concerned in its unity," as St. Austin doth often teach.†

The places therefore of Scripture which do represent the Church one, as unquestionably they belong (in their principal notion and intent) to the true universal Church, (called the Church mystical and invisible;) so may they by analogy and participation be understood to concern the visible Church Catholic here in earth; which professeth faith in Christ, and obedience to his laws. ‡

And of this Church (under due reference to the other) the question is, wherein the unity of it doth consist, or on what grounds it is called one; being that it compriseth in itself so many persons, societies, and nations?

For resolution of which question, we may consider that a community of men may be termed one on several accounts and grounds; as,

For specifical unity of nature, or as *unum genus;* so are all men one by participation of common rationality; τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, *humanum genus.*

For cognation of blood; as, *gens una;* so are all Jews, however living dispersedly over the world, reckoned one nation or people; so all kinsmen do constitute one family; and thus also all men, as made of one blood, are one people.

For commerce of language; so Italians and Germans are esteemed one people, although living under different laws and governments.

For consent in opinion, or conformity in manners and prac-

* Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 13.

† Non ad eam pertinent avari, raptores, fœneratores. Videntur esse in Ecclesia, non sunt. Aug. de Bapt. contr. Don. iv. 1. vi. 3. Ecclesiam veram intelligere non audeo nisi in sanctis et justis. Ibid. v. 27. &c.

‡ Clem. Alex. Str. p. 514.

tices; as, men of the same sect in religion or philosophy, of the same profession, faculty, trade: so Jews, Mahometans, Arians; so orators, grammarians, logicians; so divines, lawyers, physicians, merchants, artisans, rustics, &c.

For affection of mind, or compacts of goodwill; or for links of peace and amicable correspondence; in order to mutual interest and aid; as, friends and confederates.

For being ranged in order under one law and rule; as, those who live under one monarchy, or in one commonwealth; as the people in England, Spain, France; in Venice, Genoa, Holland, &c.

On such grounds of unity, or union, a society of men is denominated one; and, on divers such accounts, it is plain that the Catholic Church may be said to be one. For,

I. It is evident that the Church is one by consent in faith and opinion concerning all principal matters of doctrine, especially in those which have considerable influence on the practice of piety toward God, righteousness toward men, and sobriety of conversation: to 'teach us which the grace of God did appear.'

As he that should in any principal doctrine differ from Plato, (denying the immortality of the soul, the providence of God, the natural difference of good and evil) would not be a Platonist; so he that dissenteth from any doctrine of importance, manifestly taught by Christ, doth renounce Christianity.

All Christians are 'delivered into one form of doctrine;' to which they must stiffly and stedfastly adhere, keeping the depositum committed to them; they most 'strive together for the faith of the gospel;' and 'earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints:' they must 'hold fast the form of sound words—in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus;' that 'great salvation, which at first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto them by his hearers, God also bearing them witness with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will.'

They are bound 'to mind,' or think, 'one and the same thing;' 'to stand fast in one spirit with one mind;' 'to walk by the same rule;' 'to be joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment;' 'with one mind and mouth to glorify God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

They are obliged to disclaim consortship with the gainsayers of this doctrine; 'to stand off from those who do ἑτεροδοξεῖν, or who do 'not consent to the wholesome words—of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godli-

ness;' to 'mark those who make divisions and scandals beside the doctrine which Christians had learned, and to decline from them;' to 'reject heretics;' to 'beware of false prophets, of seducers; of those who speak perverse things to draw disciples after them;' to 'pronounce anathema on whoever shall preach any other doctrine.'

Thus are all Christians 'one in Christ Jesus:' thus are they (as Tertullian speaketh) "confederated in the society of a sacrament,"* or of one profession.

"This preaching and this faith the Church having received, though dispersed over the world, doth carefully hold, as inhabiting one house; and alike believeth these things, as if it had one soul, and the same heart, and consonantly doth preach, and teach, and deliver these things, as if it had but one mouth."†

"As for kings, though their kingdoms be divided, yet he equally expects from every one of them one dispensation, and one and the same sacrifice of a true confession and praise. So that, though there may seem to be a diversity of temporal ordinances, yet an unity and agreement in the right faith may be held and maintained among them."‡

In regard to this union in faith peculiarly the body of Christians, adhering to it, was called the Catholic Church, from which all those were esteemed *ipso facto* to be cut off and separated who in any point deserted that faith; such a one, (saith St. Paul,) ἐξέστραπται, is turned aside, or hath left the Christian way of life. He in reality is no Christian, nor is to be avowed or treated as such, but is to be disclaimed, rejected, and shunned.

"He," saith St. Cyprian, "cannot seem a Christian, who doth not persist in the unity of Christ's gospel and faith."§

"If," saith Tertullian, "a man be a heretic, he cannot be a Christian.'‖

Whence Hegesippus saith of the old heretics, that they did "divide the unity of the Church by pernicious speeches against God, and his Christ."¶

"The virtue" (saith the Pastor Hermes, cited by Clemens Alex.) "which doth keep the Church together, is faith."**

So the Fathers of the sixth council tell the emperor that "they were members one of another, and did constitute the one

* Tertull. in Marc. iv. 5.
† Iren. i. 3. (apud Epiph. Hær. 31.)
‡ (P. Leo II. Epist. 5. ad Ervigium R. Hisp.)
§ Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. ‖ Tert. de Præscr. cap. 37.
¶ Eus. Hist. iv. 22. ** Herm. apud Clem. Strom. ii. p. 281.

body of Christ, by consent in opinion with him and one another; and by faith."*

"We ought in all things to hold the unity of the Catholic Church; and not to yield in any thing to the enemies of faith and truth."†

"In each part of the world this faith is one, because this is the Christian faith."‡

"He denies Christ, who confesses not all things that are Christ's."§

Hence in common practice, whoever did appear to differ from the common faith. was rejected as an apostate from Christianity, and unworthy the communion of other Christians.

There are points of less moment, more obscurely delivered—in which Christians without breach of unity may dissent, about which they may dispute, in which they may err—without breach of unity, or prejudice to charity.‖

The faith of Christians did at first consist in few points, those which were professed in baptism, whereof we have divers summaries in the ancients—by analogy whereto all other propositions were expounded, and according to agreement whereto sound doctrines were distinguished from false: so that he was accounted orthodox who did not violate them—.

"So he that holds that immovable rule of truth which he received at his baptism, will know the words and sayings and parables which are taken out of the Scriptures," &c.¶

II. It is evident that all Christians are united by the bands of mutual charity and good-will.

They are all bound to wish one another well, to have a complacence in the good, and a compassion of the evils incident to each other, to discharge all offices of kindness, succor, consolation to each other.

This is the command of Christ to all; ('This is my commandment,' saith he, 'That ye love one another;') this is the common badge by which his disciples are discerned and distinguished, 'Hereby,' saith he, 'shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another:' they must have the same love: they must 'love as brethren, be compassionate, pitiful, courteous each to other:' they must 'bear one another's bur-

* Conc. VI. Act. xviii. p. 271.
† Cypr. Ep. 71. (ad Quint. de Steph. P.)
‡ Aug. contr. Jul. i. 2. (p. 203, 2.)
§ Ambr. in Luc. lib. vi. cap. 9. p. 90. (Vid. p. 85.)
‖ Aug. contr. Jul. i. 2. p. 205. Aug. ad Jan. Ep. 118. 86. (ad Casal.)
¶ Iren. i. 1. Vid. Gr. (p. 4.)

dens;' and, 'especially, as they have opportunity, do good to the household of faith.' 'If one member suffer, all the members must suffer with it; and if one member be honored, all the members must rejoice.' 'The multitude of them who believe must be (like that in the Acts) of one heart and of one soul.' They must 'walk in love,' and 'do all things in love.'

Whoever therefore doth highly offend against charity, maligning or mischieving his brethren, doth thereby separate himself from Christ's body, and cease to be a Christian.

"They that are enemies to brotherly charity, whether they are openly out of the Church, or seem to be within, they are Pseudo-Christians and anti-christs.—When they seem to be within the Church, they are separated from that invisible conjunction of charity; whence St. John, they went out from us, but were not of us. He saith not, that by their going out they were made aliens, but because they were aliens, therefore he declareth that they went out."*

Wherefore the most notorious violations of charity being the causing of dissensions and factions in the Church, the causeless separation from any church, the unjust condemnation of churches —whoever was guilty of any such unchristian behavior was rejected by the fathers, and held to be no Christian. Such were the Novatians, the Donatists, the Meletians, the Luciferians, and other schismatics.

"For what can be more acceptable and pleasant than to see those who are severed and scattered into so many places, yet knit and joined together in the bond and union of charity, as harmonious members of the body of Christ."†

"In old time—when the Church of God florished, being rooted in the same faith, united in love: there being, as it were, one conspiracy or league of different members in one body."‡

"For the communion of the Spirit is wont to knit and unite men's minds; which conjunction we believe to be between us and your charitable affection."§

They therefore who by the bond of charity are incorporated into the building settled on the rock."‖

"But the members of Christ are joined together by the charity of union, and by the same cleave close to their head, which is Christ."¶

III. All Christians are united by spiritual cognation and

* Aug. de Bapt. iii. 19. † Bas. Ep. 220.
‡ Bas. Ep. 338. § Bas. Ep. 182.
‖ Aug. de Unit. cap. 18. ¶ Aug. de Unit. cap. 2.

alliance; as being all 'regenerated by the same incorruptible seed,' being alike 'born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;' whence, as the sons of God, and brethren of Christ, they become brethren one to another: so that it is a peculiar title or appellation of Christians, 'the brethren' signifying all Christian people; and 'a brother' being the same with a Christian professor.

IV. The whole Christian Church is one by its incorporation into the mystical body of Christ; or as fellow-subjects of that spiritual, heavenly kingdom, whereof Christ is the sovereign head and governor; whence they are governed by the same laws, are obliged by the same institutions and sanctions; they partake of the same privileges, and are entitled to the same promises, and encouraged by the same rewards; ('being called in one hope of their calling.')

So they make up one spiritual corporation or republic, whereof Christ is the sovereign Lord.

"Though the place disjoin them, yet the Lord joins them together, being their common Lord," &c.*

Hence a habit of disobedience doth sever a man from this body; for, 'Not every one that saith, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven,' or continue therein. Every such person who denieth God in works is a rebel, an outlaw, renouncing his allegiance, forfeiting his title to God's protection and favor.

He is not a sheep of Christ, because he doth not hear his voice.†

He is separated from the body, by not holding the head.

"It is a lie to call one's self a Christian, and not to do the works of Christ."‡

"He that does not the work of a Christian name, seems not to be a Christian."§

"When instead of the works themselves he begins to oppose even the most apparent truth, whereby he is reproved, then he is cut off (from the body, or the Church.)"‖

Hence St. Austin often denieth wicked persons to be in the Church, or to appertain unto its unity.

"For when there is one and the same Lord that dwelleth in us, he everywhere joins and couples those that are his with the bond of unity."¶

* Chrys. in 1 Cor. Orat. 1. Vid.
† Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 10. ‡ Ambr.
§ Salv. de Gub. D. 4. ‖ Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 20.
¶ Firmil. apud Cypr. Ep. 75.

V. All Christians are linked together in peaceable concord and confederacy: so that they are bound to live in good correspondence; to communicate in works of piety and devotion; to defend and promote the common interest of their profession.

On the entrance of the gospel by our Lord's incarnation, it was by a celestial herald proclaimed, 'Peace on earth and goodwill among men.' It was our Lord's office to preach peace. It was a principal end and effect of his death to reconcile all men, and to destroy enmity. He specially charged his disciples εἰρηνεύειν ἐν ἀλλήλοις, to maintain peace one with another. It was his will at parting with them, 'Peace I leave with you.'

The Apostles frequently do enjoin to 'pursue peace with all them who call on the Lord with a pure heart;' to follow the things 'which make for peace and edification mutual;' to 'keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.'

It was in the prophecies concerning the evangelical state declared, that under it 'The wolf should dwell with the lamb, and the leopard should lie down with the kid, and the sucking child should play on the hole of the asp,' that is, that men of all tempers and conditions, by virtue of this institution, should be disposed to live innocently, quietly, and lovingly together; so that they should 'not hurt or destroy in all God's holy mountain;' for that would be a duty incumbent on the disciples of this institution, which all good Christians would observe.

The evangelical covenant, as it doth ally us to God, so it doth confederate us together: the sacraments of this covenant are also symbols of peace and amity between those who undertake it. Of baptism it is said, 'that so many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ;' and thence, 'Ye are all one in Christ Jesus.' All in one spirit have been baptised into one body.' And in the Eucharist, by partaking of one individual food, they are transmuted into one body and substance: 'We,' saith St. Paul, 'being many are one bread, one body; for all of us do partake of one bread.'

"By which sacraments also our people appear to be united: for, as many grains collected, and ground, and mingled together, make one bread; so in Christ, who is the bread of heaven, we may know ourselves to be one body, that our company or number be conjoined and united together."*

"With us there is both one Church, and one mind, and undivided concord."†

* Cypr. Ep. 63. † Cypr. Ep. 57.

"Let us hold the peace of the Catholic Church in the unity of concord."*

"The bond of concord remaining, and the individual sacrament of the Catholic Church continuing," &c.†

"He therefore that keeps neither the unity of the Spirit, nor the conjunction of peace, and separates himself from the bond of the Church, and the college (or society) of priests, can have neither the power of a bishop, nor the honor."‡

Thus in general. But particularly, all Christians should assist one another in the common defence of truth, piety, and peace, when they are assaulted, in the propagation of the faith, and enlargement of the Church, which is συναθλεῖν τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 'to contend together for the faith of the gospel; to be good soldiers of Christ; warring the good warfare;—striving for the faith once delivered to the saints.'

Hence if any where any heresy or bad doctrine should arise, all Christians should be ready to declare against it; that it may not infect, or spread a doubt arising, as in the case of celebrating Easter; "They all, with one consent, declared by letters the decree of the Church to all everywhere."§

Especially the pastors of the churches are obliged with consent to oppose it.‖

"While we labored here, and withstood the force of envy with the whole strength of our faith, your speech assisted us very much."¶

Thus did the bishops of several churches meet to suppress the heresy of P. Samosatenus.

This was the ground of most synods.

"So they who afterward in all places and several ways were gathered together against the innovations of heretics, gave their common opinion in behalf of the faith, as being of one mind; what they had approved among themselves in a brotherly way, that they clearly transferred to those who were absent: and they who at the Council of Sardis had earnestly contended against the remainders of Arius, sent their judgment to those of the eastern churches: and they who had then discovered the infection of Apollinarius, made their opinions known to the western."**

If any dissension or faction doth arise in any church, other

* Ep. 45. † Ep. 52. (ad Anton. p. 96.)
‡ Ibid. p. 97. § Euseb. v. 23. ‖ Cypr. Ep. 67.
¶ Cypr. Ep. 23.
** Syn. Chalced. ad Imper. Conc. Chal. pars iii. p. 78.

churches, on notice thereof, should yield their aid to quench and suppress it; countenancing the peaceable, checking and disavowing the factious.

Thus did St. Cyprian help to discountenance and quash the Novatian schism.*

Thus when the oriental churches did labor under the Arian faction, and dissensions between the Catholics, St. Basil (with other orthodox bishops consorting with him) did write to the western bishops (of Italy and France) to yield their succor.

"For this, my brother, we must earnestly endeavor, and ought to endeavor, to have a care, as much as in us lies, to hold the unity delivered to us from the Lord, and by the Apostles, whose successors we are: and what lies in us," &c.†

All Christians should be ready, when opportunity doth invite, to admit one another to conjunction in offices of piety and charity; in prayer, in communion of the Eucharist, in brotherly conversation, and pious conference for edification or advice.

"So that he who flies and avoids communion with us, you in your prudence may know that such a man breaks himself off from the whole Church."‡

St. Chrysostom doth complain of Epiphanius;

"Then when he came to the great and holy city Constantinople, he came not out into the congregation according to custom and the ancient manner, he joined not himself with us, nor communicated with us in the word, and prayer, and the holy communion," &c.§

So Polycarp, being at Rome, did communicate with P. Anicetus.‖

If dissension arise between divers churches, another may interpose to reconcile them; as did the church of Carthage, between that of Rome and Alexandria.¶

If any bishop were exceedingly negligent in the discharge of his office, (to the common damage of truth and piety,) his neighbor bishops might admonish him thereto; and, if he should not reform, might deprive him of communion.**

All Christians should hold friendly correspondence, as occasion doth serve, and as it is useful, to signify consent in faith, to recommend persons, to foster charity, to convey succor and advice, to perform all good offices of amity and peace.

* Vid. Ep. 42. (ad Cornel.) p. 77. † Cypr. Ep. xlii. p. 78.
‡ Bas. Ep. 75. § Chrys. ad Innoc. P. (Ep. 122.)
‖ Euseb. v. 24. ¶ Cod. Afr. Can. 101.
** Cod. Afr. Can. 123.

"Siricius, who is our companion and fellow-laborer, with whom the whole world by mutual commerce of canonical or communicatory letters agree together with us in one common society."*

"The Catholic Church being one body, it is consequent thereto, that we write and signify one to another," &c.†

In cases of doubt or difficulty one church should have recourse to others for advice; and any church should yield it.

"But common charity and reason requires, most dear brethren, that we conceal nothing from your knowlege of those things which are done among us, that so there may be common advice taken by us concerning the most useful way of ordering ecclesiastical affairs."‡

One church should acquaint others of any extraordinary transaction concerning the common faith or discipline; requesting their approbation and countenance. §

Thus did the eastern churches give account to all other churches of their proceedings against P. Samosatenus.||

"Which letters are sent all the world over, and brought to the notice of all the churches, and of all the brethren."¶

When any church, or any pastor, was oppressed or injured, he might have recourse to other churches for their assistance, in order to relief.

"Let him who is cast out have power to apply himself to the neighboring bishops, that his cause may be carefully heard and discussed."**

Thus did Athanasius (being overborne and expelled from his see by the Arian faction) go for refuge to the church of Rome.

St. Chrysostom had recourse to the bishop of Rome, and to those of the west, as also to the bishop of Antioch.

VI. Now because in the transacting of these things, the pastors have the chief hand, and act in behalf of the churches which they inspect, therefore is the Church united also by their consent in doctrine, their agreement in peace, their maintaining intercourse, their concurrence to preserve truth and charity.

"We ought all to be vigilant and careful for the body of

* Opt. lib. ii. p. 40.

† Alex. Alexandriæ. Socr. i. 6. Theod.

‡ Cyp. Ep. 29. (ad Cler. Rom.)

§ The practice of this we see frequently in St. Cyprian's Epistles; particularly in Epist. 4. 15. 23. 29. 30. 42. 48. (P. Corn.)

|| Euseb. vii. 30. ¶ Cypr. Ep. 52. ad Anton. p. 92.)

** Conc. Sard. Can. 17. Vid. Cod. Afr. Can. 125.

the whole Church, where members are dispersed through many several provinces."*

"Seeing the Church, which is one and Catholic, is not rent nor divided, but truly knit and united together by the bond of priests united one to another."†

"This agrees with the modesty and discipline and the very life of all, that many of the bishops meeting together might order all things in a religious way by common advice."‡

"That, since it having pleased God to grant us peace, we begin to have greater meetings of bishops, we may also by their advice order and reform every thing."§

"Which that, with the rest of our colleagues, we may stedfastly and firmly administer; and that we may keep the peace of the Church in the unanimity of concord, the divine favor will vouchsafe to accomplish."||

"A great number of bishops—we met together."¶

Bishops being chosen did acquaint other bishops with it: "It was sufficient," saith St. Cyprian to Cornelius, "that you should by your letters acquaint us that you were made a bishop."**

"Declare plainly to us who is substituted at Arles in the room of Marcian, that we may know to whom we should direct our brethren, and to whom we should write."††

All churches were to ratify the elections of bishops duly made by others, and to communicate with those.‡‡ And likewise to comply with all reasonable acts for communion.

To preserve this peace and correspondence, it was a law and custom that no church should admit to communion those which were excommunicated by another; or who did schismatically divide.

"We are all believed to have done the same thing, whereby we are found to be all of us associated and joined together by the same agreement in censure and discipline."§§

The decrees of bishops were sent to be subscribed.||||

VII. All Christian churches are one by a specifical unity of discipline, resembling one another in ecclesiastical administra-

* Cypr. Ep. 30. (Cler. Rom. ad Cypr. P.)
† Cypr. Ep. 69.
‡ Cypr. Ep. 14. (Clero suo.)
§ Cypr. Ep. 15. (Clero Rom.)
|| Cypr. Ep. 45. (ad Cornel.)
¶ Cypr. Ep. 52. (ad Anton.)
** Cypr. ad Cornel. (Epist. 42.)
†† Cypr. Ep. 67. P. ad Steph.
‡‡ Cypr. Ep. 41. 42. 52. (pag. 93.)
§§ Cler. Rom. ad Cypr. Epist. 31.
|||| Vid. Conc. Sard. P. Leonis II. Ep. 2. (ad Hisp. Episc.) N. B. p. 385. (tom. v.) P. Bened. II. Ep. 16. (p. 404.)

tions, which are regulated by the indispensable sanctions and institutions of their sovereign.

They are all bound to use the same sacraments, according to the forms appointed by our Lord, not admitting any substantial alteration.

They must uphold that sort of order, government, and ministry in all its substantial parts which God did appoint in the Church, or give thereto, as St. Paul expresseth it; it being a temerarious and dangerous thing to innovate in those matters which our Lord had a special care to order and settle.

"Nor can they continue in the Church that have not retained divine and ecclesiastical discipline, neither in good conversation, nor peaceable life."*

In lesser matters of ceremony or discipline (instituted by human prudence) churches may differ, and it is expedient they should do so, in regard to the various circumstances of things, and qualities of persons to which discipline should be accommodated; but no power ought to abrogate, destroy, or infringe, or violate the main form of discipline, constituted by divine apppointment.†

Hence, when some confessors had abetted Novatianus against Cornelius, thereby (against a fundamental rule of the Church, necessary for preserving of peace and order therein, that but one bishop should be in one church) St. Cyprian‡ doth thus complain of their proceeding.

(To act any thing) "against the sacrament of divine ordination and Catholic unity, once delivered, makes an adulterate and contrary head out of the Church."§

——"Forsaking the Lord's priests contrary to the evangelical discipline; a new tradition of a sacrilegious institution starts up."‖

"There is one God, and one Christ, and one Church, and one see founded on Peter by the word of the Lord; besides one altar and one priesthood, another altar cannot be erected, nor a new priesthood ordained."¶

Hence were the Meletians rejected by the Church, for introducing ordinations——.

Hence was Aërius accounted a heretic, for meaning to innovate in so grand a point of discipline, as the subordination of bishops and presbyters.

* P. Cornel. apud Cyprian. Ep. 48. Vid. Ep. 73. (ad Jub.)
† Ep. Firmil. (pag. 198) Aug. Ep. 118. et 86. supra.
‡ Ep. 44. (ad Confess. Rom.)
§ Cyprian. Epist. 42. (ad Cornel.)
‖ Cypr. Ep. 40. (Plebi suæ.) ¶ Ibid

VIII. It is expedient that all churches should conform to each other in great matters of prudential discipline, although not instituted or prescribed by God: for this is a means of preserving peace, and is a beauty or harmony. For difference of practice doth alienate affections, especially in common people.

So the Synod of Nice:

"That all things may be alike ordered in every diocese, it hath seemed good to the holy synod that men should put up their prayers to God standing,"* (viz. between Easter and Whitsuntide, and on the Lord's day.)

The Church is like the world; for as the world doth consist of men, all naturally subject to one King, Almighty God; all obliged to observe his laws, declared by natural light; all made of one blood, and so brethren; all endowed with common reason; all bound to exercise good offices of justice and humanity toward each other; to maintain peace and amity together; to further each other in the prosecution or attainment of those good things which conduce to the welfare and security of this present life: even so doth the Church consist of persons spiritually allied, professing the same faith, subject to the same law and government of Christ's heavenly kingdom; bound to exercise charity, and to maintain peace toward each other, and to promote each other's good in order to the future happiness in heaven.

All those kinds of unity do plainly agree to the universal Church of Christ; but the question is, Whether the Church is also necessarily, by the design and appointment of God, to be in way of external policy under one singular government or jurisdiction of any kind; so as a kingdom or commonwealth are united under the command of one monarch or one senate?

That the Church is capable of such an union, is not the controversy; that it is possible it should be so united, (supposing it may happen that all Christians may be reduced to one nation, or one civil regiment; or that several nations spontaneously may confederate and combine themselves into one ecclesiastical commonwealth, administered by the same spiritual rulers and judges according to the same laws,) I do not question; that when in a manner all Christendom did consist of subjects to the Roman empire, the Church then did arrive near such an unity, I do not at present contest; but that such an union of all Christians is necessary, or that it was ever insti-

* Can. 20. Const. M. in Epist. ad Eccles. Euseb. Vita Constantini. iii. 18.

tuted by Christ, I cannot grant; and, for my refusal of that opinion, I shall assign divers reasons.

1. This being a point of great consideration, and trenching on practice, which every one were concerned to know; and there being frequent occasions to declare it; yet the holy Scripture doth no where express or intimate such a kind of unity; which is a sufficient proof that it hath no firm ground. We may say of it, as St. Austin saith of the Church itself, "I will not that the holy Church be demonstrated from human reasonings, but the divine oracles."*

St. Paul particularly, in divers epistles, designedly treating about the unity of the Church, (together with other points of doctrine neighboring thereon,) and amply describing it, doth not yet imply any such unity then extant, or designed to be.

He doth mention and urge the unity of spirit, of faith, of charity, of peace, of relation to our Lord, of communion in devotions and offices of piety; but concerning any union under one singular visible government or polity he is silent: he saith, 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all:' not one monarch, or one senate, or one sanhedrin—which is a pregnant sign that none such was then instituted; otherwise he could not have slipped over a point so very material and pertinent to his discourse.

2. By the apostolical history it may appear that the Apostles, in the propagation of Christianity, and founding of Christian societies, had no meaning, did take no care, to establish any such polity.

They did resort to several places, (whither divine instinct or reasonable occasion did carry them,) where, by their preaching having convinced and converted a competent number of persons to the embracing Christian doctrine, they did appoint pastors to instruct and edify them, to administer God's worship and service among them, to contain them in good order and peace, exhorting them to maintain good correspondence of charity and peace with all good Christians otherwhere: this is all we can see done by them.

3. The Fathers, in their set treatises, and in their incidental discourses about the unity of the Church, (which was *de facto*, which should be *de jure* in the Church,) do make it to consist only in those unions of faith, charity, peace, which we have described, not in this political union.

The Roman church gave this reason why they could not

* Aug. de Unit. cap. 3.

admit Marcion into their communion, they would not do it without his father's consent, between whom and them "there was one faith, and one agreement of mind."*

Tertullian, in his Apologetic, describing the unity of the Church in his time, saith, "We are one body by our agreement in religion, our unity of discipline, and our being in the same covenant of hope."†

And more exactly and largely in his Prescriptions against Heretics, the breakers of unity. "Therefore such and so many churches are but the same with the first apostolical one, from which all are derived: thus they become all first, all apostolical; whilst they maintain the same unity; whilst there are a communion of peace, names of brotherhood, and contributions of hospitality among them: the rights of which are kept up by no other means, but the one tradition of the same mystery."‡

"They and we have one faith, one God, the same Christ, the same hope, the same baptism; in a word, we are but one Church."§

And Constantine the Great in his epistle to the churches;

(Our Saviour) "would have his Catholic Church to be one: the members of which, though they be divided into many and different places, are yet cherished by one Spirit, that is, by the will of God."‖

And Gregory the Great:

"Our head, which is Christ, would therefore have us be his members, that by the joints of charity and faith he might make us one body in himself."¶

Clemens Alexandrinus defineth the Church;

"A people gathered together out of Jews and Gentiles into one faith, by the giving of the testaments fitted into unity of faith."**

"This one Church therefore partakes of the nature of unity, which heresies violently endeavor to divide into many: and therefore we affirm the ancient and Catholic Church, whether we respect its constitution or our conception of it, its beginning or its excellency, to be but one; which into the belief of that one creed which is agreeable to its own peculiar testaments, or rather to that one and the same testament, in times however different, by the will of one and the same God, through one

* Epiph. Hær. 42. † Apol. 39.
‡ Tertul. Præscript. cap. 20. § Tert. de Virg. vel. 2.
‖ Const. M. in Ep. ad Eccles. Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 18.
¶ Greg. M. Ep. vii. 111. ** Strom. vi. init. vii. (p. 516.)

and the same Lord, doth unite and combine together all those who are before ordained, whom God hath predestinated, as knowing that they would be just persons before the foundation of the world."*

Many passages in the Fathers, applicable to this point, we have alleged in the foregoing discourses.†

4. The constitution of such an unity doth involve the vesting some person or some number of persons with a sovereign authority, (subordinate to our Lord,) to be managed in a certain manner, either absolutely, according to pleasure, or limitedly according to certain rules prescribed to it.

But that there was ever any such authority constituted, or any rules prescribed to it by our Lord or his Apostles, doth not appear; and there are divers reasonable presumptions against it.

It is reasonable that whoever claimeth such authority, should for assuring his title show patents of his commission, manifestly expressing it; how otherwise can he justly demand obedience, or any with satisfaction yield thereto?

It was just that the institution of so great authority should be fortified with an undoubted charter: that its right might be apparent, and the duty of subjection might be certain.

If any such authority had been granted by God, in all likelihood it would have been clearly mentioned in Scripture: it being a matter of high importance among the establishments of Christianity, conducing to great effects, and grounding much duty. Especially considering that

There is in Scripture frequent occasion of mentioning it; in way of history, touching the use of it, (the acts of sovereign power affording chief matter to the history of any society) in way of direction to those governors how to manage it; in way of exhortation to inferiors how to behave themselves in regard to it; in way of commending the advantages which attend it: it is therefore strange that its mention is so balked.

The Apostles do often speak concerning ecclesiastical affairs of all natures, concerning the decent administration of things, concerning preservation of order and peace, concerning the furtherance of edification, concerning the prevention and removal of heresies, schisms, factions, disorders: on any of which occasions it is marvellous that they should not touch that constitution which was the proper means appointed for maintenance of truth, order, peace, decency, edification, and all such purposes, for remedy of all contrary mischiefs.

* Strom. vii. (p. 549.) † Opt. I. (p. 14.) Hier. Ps. 133.

There are mentioned divers schisms and dissensions, the which the Apostles did strive by instruction and persuasion to remove; in which cases, supposing such an authority in being, it is a wonder that they do not mind the parties dissenting of having recourse thereto for decision of their causes, that they do not exhort them to a submission thereto, that they do not reprove them for declining such a remedy.

It is also strange that no mention is made of any appeal made by any of the dissenting parties to the judgment of such authority.

Indeed, if such an authority had then been avowed by the Christian churches, it is hardly conceivable that any schisms could subsist, there being so powerful a remedy against them; then notably visible and most effectual, because of its fresh institution, before it was darkened or weakened by age.

Whereas the apostolical writings do inculcate our subjection to one Lord in heaven, it is much they should never consider his vicegerent, or vicegerents on earth; notifying and pressing the duties of obedience and reverence toward them.

There are indeed exhortations to honor the elders, and to obey the guides of particular churches; but the honor and obedience due to those paramount authorities, or universal governors, is passed over in dead silence, as if no such thing had been thought of.

They do expressly avow the secular preeminence, and press submission to the emperor as supreme; why do they not likewise mention this no less considerable ecclesiastical supremacy, or enjoin obedience thereto? why 'honor the king,' and be 'subject to principalities' so often, but honor the spiritual prince or senate doth never occur?

If there had been any such authority, there would probably have been some intimation concerning the persons in whom it was settled, concerning the place of their residence, concerning the manner of its being conveyed, (by election, succession, or otherwise.)

Probably the persons would have some proper name, title, or character to distinguish them from inferior governors; that to the place some mark of preeminence would have been affixed.

It is not unlikely that somewhere some rules or directions would have been prescribed for the management of so high a trust, for preventing miscarriages and abuses to which it is notoriously liable.

It would have been declared absolute, or the limits of it

would have been determined, to prevent its enslaving God's heritage.

But of these things in the apostolical writings, or in any near those times, there doth not appear any footstep or pregnant intimation.

There hath never to this day been any place but one, (namely Rome,) which hath pretended to be the seat of such an authority; the plea whereof we largely have examined.

At present we shall only observe that before the Roman church was founded, there were churches otherwhere; there was a great church at Jerusalem, (which indeed was 'the mother of all churches,'* and was by the Fathers so styled, however Rome now arrogates to herself that title.) There were issuing from that mother a fair offspring of churches (those of Judea, of Galilæa, of Samaria, of Syria and Cilicia, of divers other places) before there was any church at Rome, or that St. Peter did come thither; which was at least divers years after our Lord's ascension. St. Paul was converted—after five years he went to Jerusalem, then St. Peter was there; after fourteen years thence he went to Jerusalem again, and then St Peter was there; after that he met with St. Peter at Antioch. When then was this authority seated? How then did the political unity of the Church subsist? Was the seat of the sovereign authority first resident at Jerusalem, when St. Peter preached there? Did it walk thence to Antiochia, fixing itself there for seven years? Was it thence translated to Rome, and settled there ever since? Did this roving and inconstancy become it?

5. The primitive state of the Church did not well comport with such an unity.

For Christian churches were founded in distant places, as the Apostles did find opportunity, or received direction to found them; which therefore could not, without extreme inconvenience, have resort or reference to one authority, any where fixed.

Each church therefore separately did order its own affairs, without recourse to others, except for charitable advice or relief in cases of extraordinary difficulty or urgent need.

Each church was endowed with a perfect liberty, and a full authority, without dependence or subordination to others, to govern its own members, to manage its own affairs, to decide controversies and causes incident among themselves, without allowing appeals, or rendering accounts to others.

* Conc. Const. in Synod. Ep. Theod. v. 9.

This appeareth by the apostolical writings of St. Paul and St. John to single churches; wherein they are supposed able to exercise spiritual power for establishing decency, removing disorders, correcting offences, deciding causes, &c.

6. This *αὐτονομία*, and liberty of churches, doth appear to have long continued in practice inviolate; although tempered and modelled in accommodation to the circumstances of place and time.

It is true, that if any church did notoriously forsake the truth, or commit disorder in any kind, other churches did sometime take on them (as the case did move) to warn, advise, reprove it, and to declare against its proceedings, as prejudicial, not only to the welfare of that Church, but to the common interests of truth and peace; but this was not in way of commanding authority, but of fraternal solicitude; or of that liberty which equity and prudence do allow to equals in regard to common good: so did the Roman church interpose in reclaiming the church of Corinth from its disorders and seditions: so did St. Cyprian and St. Denys of Alexandria meddle in the affairs of the Roman church, exhorting Novatian and his adherents to return to the peace of their church.*

It is also true that the bishops of several adjacent churches did use to meet on emergences, (concerning the maintenance of truth, order, and peace; concerning settlement and approbation of pastors, &c.) to consult and conclude on expedients for attaining such ends; this probably they did at first in a free way, without rule, according to occasion, as prudence suggested; but afterwards, by confederation and consent, those conventions were formed into method, and regulated by certain orders established by consent, whence did arise an ecclesiastical unity of government within certain precincts, much like that of the United States in the Netherlands; the which course was very prudential, and useful for preserving the truth of religion and unity of faith against heretical devices springing up in that free age; for maintaining concord and good correspondence among Christians, together with an harmony in manners and discipline; for that otherwise Christendom would have been shattered and crumbled into numberless parties, discordant in opinion and practice; and consequently alienated in affection, which inevitably among most men doth follow difference of opinion and manners; so that in short time it would not have appeared what Christianity was, and consequently the religion, being overgrown with differences and discords, must have perished.

* Iren. iii. cap. 2.

Thus in the case about admitting the Lapsi to communion, St. Cyprian relates, "when the persecution [of Decius] ceased, so that leave was now given us to meet in one place together, a considerable number of bishops whom their own faith and God's protection had preserved sound and intire, [from the late apostacy and persecution] being assembled, we deliberated of the composition of the matter with wholesome moderation," &c.*

"Which thing also Agrippinus of blessed memory with his other fellow-bishops who then governed the Church of Christ in the African province, and in Numidia, did establish; and by the well-weighed examination of the common advice of them all together confirmed it."†

Thus it was the custom in the churches of Asia, as Firmilian telleth us in those words:

"On which occasion it necessarily happens, that every year we the elders and rulers do come together to regulate those things which are committed to our care; that if there should be any things of greater moment, by common advice they be determined."‡

Yet while things went thus, in order to common truth and peace; every church in more private matters, touching its own particular state, did retain its liberty and authority, without being subject or accountable to any but the common Lord; in such cases even synods of bishops did not think it proper or just for them to interpose, to the prejudice of that liberty and power which derived from a higher source.§

These things are very apparent, as by the course of ecclesiastical history, so particularly in that most precious monument of antiquity, St. Cyprian's epistles; by which it is most evident that in those times every bishop or pastor was conceived to have a double relation or capacity; one toward his own flock, another toward the whole flock:

One toward his own flock; by virtue of which, he taking advice of his presbyters, together with "the conscience of his people assisting,"|| did order all things tending to particular edification, order, peace, reformation, censure, &c. without fear of being troubled by appeals, or being liable to give any account, but to his own lord, whose vicegerent he was.¶

Another toward the whole Church, in behalf of his people;

* Cypr. Ep. 52. (ad Antonian.)
† Cypr. Epist. 71. (ad Quint.) ‡ Cypr. Ep. 75.
§ Vid. Conc. Carthag. apud Cypr. p. 399. Vid. Syn. Ant. Can. 9.
|| Cypr. Epist. 78. ¶ Ep. 52. Ep. 55. Ep. 72. ad Steph. P. Vide Ep. lxxiii. p. 186. Ep. lxxvi. p. 212.

on account whereof he did (according to occasion or order) apply himself to confer with other bishops for preservation of the common truth and peace, when they could not otherwise be well upheld, than by the joint conspiring of the pastors of divers churches.

So that the case of bishops was like to that of princes; each of whom hath a free superintendence in his own territory, but for to uphold justice and peace in the world, or between adjacent nations, the intercourse of several princes is needful.

The peace of the Church was preserved by communion of all parts together, not by the subjection of the rest to one part.

7. This political unity doth not well accord with the nature and genius of the evangelical dispensation.

Our Saviour affirmed that 'his kingdom is not of this world;' and St. Paul telleth us that it consisteth in a spiritual influence on the souls of men; producing in them virtue, spiritual joy, and peace.

It disavoweth and discountenanceth 'the elements of the world,' by which worldly designs are carried on, and worldly frames sustained.

It requireth not to be managed by politic artifices or 'fleshly wisdom,' but by simplicity, sincerity, plain-dealing: as every subject of it must lay aside all 'guile and dissimulation,' so especially the officers of it must do so, in conformity to the Apostles, who 'had their conversation in the world (and prosecuted their design) in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God;' not 'walking in craftiness,' or 'handling the word of God deceitfully,' &c.

It needeth not to be supported or enlarged by wealth and pomp, or by compulsive force and violence; for 'God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and the weak things of the world to confound the mighty; and base, despicable things, &c. that no flesh should glory in his presence.'

And, 'The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God,' &c.

It discountenanceth the imposition of new laws and precepts, beside those which God hath enjoined, or which are necessary for order and edification; derogating from the liberty of Christians and from the simplicity of our religion.

The government of the Christian state is represented purely spiritual; administered by meek persuasion, not by imperious awe; as an humble ministry, not as stately domination; for the Apostles themselves did not 'lord it over men's faith,' but

'did cooperate to their joy;' they did not preach themselves, but Christ Jesus to be the Lord; and themselves their servants for Jesus.

It is expressly forbidden to them 'to domineer over God's people.'

They are to be qualified with gentleness and patience; they are forbidden 'to strive,' and enjoined to be 'gentle toward all, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.'

They are 'to convince, to rebuke, to exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine.'*

They are furnished with no arms beside the 'divine panoply;' they bear no 'sword,' but that 'of the Spirit; which is the word of God,'——they may teach, reprove,——they cannot compel——

They are not to be entangled in the cares of this life.†

But supposing the Church was designed to be one in this manner of political regiment, it must be quite another thing, nearly resembling a worldly state, yea, in effect soon resolving itself into such an one; supposing, as is now pretended, that its management is committed to an ecclesiastical monarch, it must become a worldly kingdom; for such a polity could not be upheld without applying the same means and engines, without practising the same methods and arts, whereby secular governments are maintained.

Its majesty must be supported by conspicuous pomp and phantastry.

Its dignity and power must be supported by wealth; which it must corrade and accumulate by large incomes, by exaction of tributes and taxes.

It must exert authority in enacting of laws for keeping its state in order, and securing its interests, backed with rewards and pains; especially considering, its title being so dark, and grounded on no clear warrant, many always will contest it.

It must apply constraint and force, for procuring obedience, and correcting transgression.

It must have guards to preserve its safety and authority.

It must be engaged in wars, to defend itself and make good its interests.

It must use subtilty and artifice, for promoting its interests, and countermine the policies of adversaries.

It must erect judicatories, and must decide causes with formality of legal process; whence tedious suits, crafty pleadings,

* Hier. Ep. 3. (ad Nepot.) † Chrys. de Sacerd. 2.

quirks of law and pettifoggeries, fees and charges, extortion and barretry, &c. will necessarily creep in.*

All which things do much disagree from the original constitution and design of the Christian Church, which is averse from pomp, doth reject domination, doth not require craft, wealth, or force, to maintain it; but did at first, and may subsist without any such means.

I do not say that an ecclesiastical society may not lawfully for its support, use power, policy, wealth, in some measure to uphold or defend itself; but that a constitution needing such things is not divine; or that so far as it doth use them, it is no more than human.

Thus in effect we see that it hath succeeded from the pretence of this unity; the which hath indeed transformed the Church into a mere worldly state; wherein the monarch beareth the garb of an emperor, in external splendor surpassing all worldly princes; crowned with a triple crown.

He assumeth the most haughty titles of "Our most holy Lord," the "Vicar general of Christ," &c. and he suffereth men to call him the "Monarch of Kings," &c.

He hath respects paid him, like to which no potentate doth assume, (having his feet kissed, riding on the backs of men, letting princes hold his stirrup and lead his horse.†)

He hath a court, and is attended with a train of courtiers surpassing in state and claiming precedence to the peers of any kingdom.

He is encompassed with armed guards; Switzers.

He hath a vast revenue, supplied by tributes and imposts, sore and grievous; the exaction of which hath made divers nations of Christendom to groan most lamentably.

He hath raised numberless wars and commotions for the promotion and advancement of his interests.

He administereth things with all depth of policy, to advance his designs.

He hath enacted volumes of laws and decrees, to which obedience is exacted with rigor and forcible constraint.

He draweth grist from all parts to his courts of judgment, wherein all formalities of suspense, all the tricks of squeezing money, &c. are practised, to the great trouble and charge of parties concerned.

Briefly, it is plain that he doth exercise the proudest, mightiest, subtlest domination that ever was over Christians."‡

* Bern. de Consid. i. 9. Syn. Bass. Sess. xlii. p. 108.

† That which Seneca did take for a piece of enormous pride in Caligula. De Benef. ii. 12.

‡ Cypr. Ep. 55. (ad P. Cornel.)

8. The union of the whole Church in one body, under one government or sovereign authority, would be inconvenient and hurtful; prejudicial to the main designs of Christianity; destructive to the welfare and peace of mankind in many respects.

This we have showed particularly concerning the pretence of the papacy: and those discourses being applicable to any like universal authority, (perhaps with more advantage, monarchy being less subject to abuse than other ways of government,) I shall forbear to say more.

9. Such an union is of no need, would be of small use, or would do little good, in balance to the great mischiefs and inconveniences which it would produce.

This point also we have declared in regard to the papacy; and we might say the same concerning any other like authority substituted thereto.

10. Such a connexion of churches is not anywise needful or expedient to the design of Christianity; which is to reduce mankind to the knowlege, love, and reverence of God; to a just and loving conversation together; to the practice of sobriety, temperance, purity, meekness, and all other virtues; all which things may be compassed without forming men into such a policy.

It is expedient there should be particular societies, in which men may concur in worshipping God, and promoting that design by instructing and provoking one another to good practice, in a regular, decent, and orderly way.

It is convenient that the subjects of each temporal sovereignty should live, as in a civil, so in a spiritual uniformity, in order to the preservation of goodwill and peace among them, (for that neighbors differing in opinion and fashions of practice will be apt to contend each for his way, and thence to disaffect one another,) for the beauty and pleasant harmony of agreement in divine things, for the more commodious succor and defence of truth and piety by unanimous concurrence.

But that all the world should be so joined is needless; and will be apt to produce more mischief than benefit.

11. The Church, in the Scripture sense, hath ever continued one; and will ever continue so; notwithstanding that it hath not had this political unity.

12. It is in fact apparent that churches have not been thus united, which yet have continued Catholic and Christian.

It were great, no less folly than uncharitableness to say that the Greek church hath been none.

There is no church that hath in effect less reason than that of Rome to prescribe to others.

13. The reasons alleged in proof of such an unity are insufficient and inconcluding: the which (with great diligence, although not with like perspicuity) advanced by a late divine of great repute, and collected out of his writings with some care, are those which briefly proposed do follow; together with answers declaring their invalidity.

Arg. I. The name 'Church' is attributed to the whole body of Christians; which implieth unity.*

Answ. This indeed doth imply an unity of the Church, but determineth not the kind or ground thereof; there being several kinds of unity: one of those which we have touched, or several, or all of them may suffice to ground that comprehensive appellation.

Arg. II. Our creeds do import the belief of such an unity; for in the Apostolical we profess to believe 'the holy Catholic Church;' in the Constantinopolitan, 'the holy Catholic' and 'Apostolic Church.'†

Answ. 1. The most ancient summaries of Christian faith extant in the first Fathers, (Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, &c.) do not contain this point.‡

The word 'Catholic' was not originally in the Apostolical (or Roman) Creed, but was added after Ruffin and St. Austin's time.

This article was inserted into the creeds on the rise of heresies and schisms, to discountenance and disengage from them.

Answ. 2. We do avow a Catholic Church in many respects one; wherefore not the unity of the Church, but the kind and manner of unity being in question, the creed doth not oppose what we say, nor can with reason be alleged for the special kind of unity which is pretended.

Answ. 3. That the unity mentioned in the Constantinopolitan Creed is such as our adversaries contend for, of external policy, is precariously assumed, and relieth only on their interpretation obtruded on us.

Answ. 4. The genuine meaning of that article may reasonably be deemed this: That we profess our adhering to the body of Christians, which diffused over the world doth retain the faith taught, the discipline settled, the practices appointed by our Lord and his Apostles; that we maintain general charity toward all good Christians, that we are ready to entertain communion in holy offices with all such; that we are willing

* Epil. p. 38. Lat. p. 114. † Epil. Lat. 144.
‡ Iren. Tert. Cypr. Conc. Nic.

to observe the laws and orders established by authority or consent of the churches, for maintenance of truth, order, and peace; that we renounce all heretical doctrines, all disorderly practices, all conspiracy with any factious combinations of people.

Answ. 5. That this is the meaning of the article, may sufficiently appear from the reason and occasion of introducing it; which was to secure the truth of Christian doctrine, the authority of ecclesiastical discipline, and the common peace of the Church; according to the discourses and arguments of the Fathers, (Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Austin, Vincentius Lirinensis,) the which do plainly countenance our interpretation.

Answ. 6. It is not reasonable to interpret the article so as will not consist with the state of the Church in the apostolical and most primitive ages, when evidently there was no such a political conjunction of Christians.

Arg. III. The Apostles delivered one rule of faith to all churches, the embracing and professing whereof, celebrated in baptism, was a necessary condition to the admission into the Church, and to continuance therein; therefore Christians are combined together in one political body.*

Answ. 1. The consequence is very weak; for from the antecedent it can only be inferred that (according to the sentiment of the ancients) all Christians should consent in one faith; which unity we avow; and who denieth?

Answ. 2. By like reason all mankind must be united in one political body; because all men are bound to agree in what the light of nature discovereth to be true and good; or because the principles of natural religion, justice, and humanity are common to all.

Arg. IV. God hath granted to the Church certain powers and rights, as *jura majestatis*; namely, the power of the keys, (to admit into, to exclude from the kingdom of heaven;) a power to enact laws, (for maintenance of its order and peace, for its edification and welfare;) a power to correct and excommunicate offenders; a power to hold assemblies for God's service; a power to ordain governors and pastors.†

Answ. 1. These powers are granted to the Church, because granted to each particular church, or distinct society of Christians; not to the whole, as such, or as distinct from the parts.

Answ. 2. It is evident that by virtue of such grants parti-

* Ep. p. 40. Lat. p. 144. 151.

† Epil. p. 37. 49. Lat. p. 153. 118. Lat. p. 171.

cular churches do exercise those powers; and it is impossible to infer more from them than a justification of their practice.

Answ. 3. St. Cyprian often from that common grant doth infer the right of exercising discipline in each particular church; which inference would not be good, but on our supposition; nor indeed otherwise would any particular church have ground for its authority.

Answ. 4. God hath granted the like rights to all princes and states; but doth it thence follow that all kingdoms and states must be united in one single regiment? The consequence is just the same as in our case.

Arg. V. All churches were tied to observe the same laws or rules of practice, the same orders of discipline and customs; therefore all do make one corporation.*

Answ. 1. That all churches are bound to observe the same divine institutions, doth argue only an unity of relation to the same heavenly king, or a specifical unity and similitude of policy, the which we do avow.

Answ. 2. We do also acknowlege it convenient and decent that all churches in principal observances, introduced by human prudence, should agree so near as may be; an uniformity in such things representing and preserving unity of faith, of charity, of peace.

Whence the governors of the primitive Church did endeavor such an uniformity; as the Fathers of Nice profess in the canon forbidding of genuflexion on Lord's days, and in the days of Pentecost.†

Answ. 3. Yet doth not such an agreement, or attempt at it, infer a political unity; no more than when all men, by virtue of a primitive general tradition, were tied to offer sacrifices and oblations to God, that consideration might argue all men to have been under the same government; or no more than the usual agreement of neighbor nations in divers fashions doth conclude such an unity.

Answ. 4. In divers customs and observances several churches did vary, with allowance; which doth rather infer a difference of polity, than agreement in other observances doth argue an unity thereof.‡

* Ep. p. 42. 49. Lat. p. 151. 219. 1 Cor. xi. 16.

† Conc. Nic. Can. 20. Vide de Paschate.

‡ Vide Aug. Epist. lxxxvi. (ad Casul.) Ep. cxviii. ad Jan. Cypr. Ep. lxxv. p. 198. Iren. apud Euseb. v. 24. Socr. v. 22. vii. 19. P. Greg. I. Epist. i. 41. P. Leo IX. Epist. i. cap. 29. P. Nic. I. Ep. 6.

Answ. 5. St. Cyprian doth affirm that in such matters every bishop had a power to use his own discretion, without being obliged to comply with others.*

Arg. VI. The Jewish church was one corporation; and in correspondence thereto the Christian Church should be such.†

Answ. 1. As the Christian Church doth in some things correspond to that of the Jews, so it differeth in others, being designed to excel it: wherefore this argumentation cannot be valid; and may as well be employed for our opinion as against it.

Answ. 2. In like manner it may be argued that all Christians should annually meet in one place; that all Christians should have one archpriest on earth; that we should all be subject to one temporal jurisdiction; that we should all speak one language, &c.

Answ. 3. There is a great difference in the case; for the Israelites were one small nation, which conveniently might be embodied; but the Christian Church should consist of all nations, which rendereth correspondence in this particular unpracticable, at least without great inconvenience.

Answ. 4. Before the law, Christian religion, and consequently a Christian Church, did in substance subsist; but what unity of government was there then?‡

Answ. 5. The temporal union of the Jews might only figure the spiritual unity of Christians in faith, charity, and peace.

Arg. VII. All ecclesiastical power was derived from the same fountains, by succession from the Apostles; therefore the Church was one political body.§

Answ. 1. Thence we may rather infer that churches are not so united, because the founders of them were several persons endowed with coordinate and equal power.‖

Answ. 2. The Apostles did in several churches constitute bishops, independent from each other; and the like may be now, either by succession from those, or by the constitutions of human prudence, according to emergences of occasion, and circumstances of things.

Answ. 3. Divers churches were αὐτόνομοι· and all were so according to St. Cyprian.

Answ. 4. All temporal power is derived from Adam, and the patriarchs, ancient fathers of families: doth it thence

* Ep. 73. † Ep. p. 39. Lat. p. 159.
‡ Eus. Hist. i. 4. Baron. App. 2. § Ep. p. 51-55. Lat. p. 157.
‖ Iren. iii. 3. Tert. Præscr. 31. 32.

follow that all the world must be under one secular government?

Arg. VIII. All churches did exercise a power of excommunication, or of excluding heretics, schismatics, disorderly and scandalous people.*

Answ. 1. Each church was vested with this power: this doth therefore only infer a resemblance of several churches in discipline; which we avow.

Answ. 2. This argueth that all churches took themselves to be obliged to preserve the same faith, to exercise charity and peace, to maintain the like holiness of conversation: what then? do we deny this?

Answ. 3. All kingdoms and states do punish offenders against reason and justice, do banish seditious and disorderly persons, do uphold the principles and practice of common honesty and morality: doth it thence follow that all nations must come under one civil government?

Arg. IX. †All churches did maintain intercourse and commerce with each other by formed, communicatory, pacificatory, commendatory, synodical epistles.‡

Answ. 1. This doth signify that the churches did by admonition, advice, &c. help one another in maintenance of the common faith; did endeavor to preserve charity, friendship, and peace: this is all which thence may be concluded.

Answ. 2. Secular princes are wont to send ambassadors and envoys with letters and instructions for settlement of correspondence and preserving peace; they sometimes do recommend their subjects to other princes; they expect offices of humanity toward their subjects travelling or trading any where in the world; common reason doth require such things; but may common unity of polity from hence be inferred?

Arg. X. The effectual preservation of unity in the primitive Church is alleged as a strong argument of its being united in one government.§

Answ. 1. That unity of faith, and charity, and discipline, which we admit, was indeed preserved, not by influence of any one sovereign authority, (whereof there is no mention,) but by the concurrent vigilance of bishops, declaring and disputing against any novelty in doctrine or practice which did start up; by their adherence to the doctrine asserted in Scripture, and confirmed

* Ep. p. 59. 125. Lat. p. 185. 195. † Ep. p. 69. Lat. p. 222.
‡ Optat. 2. Conc. Milev. Can. 20. Aug. Ep. 162. 163. Euseb. vii. 30. Cypr. Ep. 55. 67. &c.
§ Ep. p. 64. Lat. p. 221.

by tradition; by their aiding and abetting one another as confederates against errors and disorders creeping in.

Answ. 2. The many differences which arose concerning the observation of Easter, the rebaptisation of heretics, the reconciliation of revolters and scandalous criminals; concerning the decision of causes and controversies, &c. do more clearly show that there was no standing common jurisdiction in the Church: for had there been such an one, recourse would have been had thereto; and such differences by its authority would easily have been quashed.

Arg. XI. Another argument is grounded on the relief which one church did yield to another, which supposeth all churches under one government, imposing such tribute.*

Answ. 1. This is a strange fetch: as if all who were under obligation to relieve one another in need, were to be under one government. Then all mankind must be so.

Answ. 2. It appeareth by St. Paul, that these succors were of free charity, favor, and liberality; and not by constraint.†

Arg. XII. The use of councils is also alleged as an argument of this unity.‡

Answ. 1. General councils (in case truth is disowned, that peace is disturbed, that discipline is loosed or perverted) are wholesome expedients to clear truth and heal breaches: but the holding them is no more an argument of political unity in the Church, than the treaty of Munster was a sign of all Europe being under one civil government.

Answ. 2. They are extraordinary, arbitrary, prudential means of restoring truth, peace, order, discipline: but from them nothing can be gathered concerning the continual ordinary state of the Church.

Answ. 3. For during a long time the Church wanted them; and afterwards had them but rarely; "For the first three hundred years," saith Bellarmine, "there was no general assembly; afterwards scarce one in a hundred years."§

And since the breach between the oriental and western churches, for many centenaries, there hath been none.

Yet was the Church from the beginning one, till Constantine and long afterwards.

Answ. 4. The first general councils (indeed all that have been with any probable show capable of that denomination) were congregated by emperors, to cure the dissensions of

* Ep. p. 119. Lat. p. 209.
† 2 Cor. viii. 3. ix. 7. Rom. xv. 26. Acts xi. 29. xxiv. 17.
‡ Ep. pag. 51. Lat. p. 400. § De Rom. P. i. 8.

bishops: what therefore can be argued from them, but that the emperors did find it good to settle peace and truth; and took this for a good mean thereto?

Alb. Pighius said that general councils were an invention of Constantine; and who can confute him?*

Answ. 5. They do show rather the unity of the empire than of the Church; or of the Church as national under one empire, than as Catholic; for it was the state which did call and moderate them to its purposes.

Answ. 6. It is manifest that the congregation of them dependeth on the permission and pleasure of secular powers; and in all equity should do so, (as otherwhere is showed.)†

Answ. 7. It is not expedient that there should be any of them, now that Christendom standeth divided under divers temporal sovereignties: for their resolutions may intrench on the interests of some princes; and hardly can they be accommodated to the civil laws and customs of every state.

Whence we see that France will not admit the decrees of their Tridentine synod.

Answ. 8. There was no such inconvenience in them while Christendom was in a manner confined within one empire; for then nothing could be decreed or executed without the emperos's leave, or to his prejudice.

Answ. 9. Yea, (as things now stand,) it is impossible there should be a free council; most of the bishops being sworn vassals and clients to the Pope; and by their own interests concerned to maintain his exorbitant grandeur and domination.‡

Answ. 10. In the opinion of St. Athanasius, there was no reasonable cause of synods, except in case of new heresies springing up, which may be confuted by the joint consent of bishops.§

Answ. 11. As for particular synods, they do only signify that it was useful for neighbor bishops so conspire in promoting truth, order, and peace, as we have otherwhere showed.‖

Councils have often been convened for bad designs, and been made engines to oppress truth, and enslave Christendom.

* Bell. de Conc. i. 13.

† The validity of synodical decrees (as spiritual) doth proceed from the obligation to each singular bishop; as if princes in confederacy do make any sanction, the subjects of each are bound to observe them, not from any relation to the body confederating, but because of their obligation to their own prince consenting.

‡ Hist. Trid. p. 67. P. Leo I. Ep.

§ Athan. de Syn. p. 873.

‖ Leo M. Ep. 62. (ad Maximum Ant. Ep.——)

That of Antioch against Athanasius: of Ariminum for Arianism. The second Ephesine, to restore Eutyches and reject Flavianus. The second of Nice, to impose the worship of babies. The synod of Ariminum, to countenance Arian. So the fourth synod of Lateran, (*sub Inn. III.*) to settle the prodigious doctrine of transubstantiation, and the wicked doctrine of papal authority over princes. The first synod of Lyons, to practise that hellish doctrine of deposing kings. The synod of Constance, to establish the maim of the Eucharist; against the Calistines of Bohemia. The Lateran (under Leo X.) was called (as the archbishop of Patras affirmed) 'for the exaltation of the apostolical see.' The synod of Trent, to settle a raff of errors and superstitions.*

Obj. II. It may farther be objected that this doctrine doth favor the conceits of the Independents, concerning ecclesiastical discipline.

I answer, No. For,

1. We do assert that every church is bound to observe the institutions of Christ, and that sort of government which the Apostles did ordain, consisting of bishops, priests, and people.

2. We avow it expedient (in conformity to the primitive churches, and in order to the maintenance of truth, order, peace) for several particular churches or parishes to be combined in political corporations; as shall be found convenient by those who have just authority to frame such corporations: for that otherwise Christianity, being shattered into numberless shreds, could hardly subsist; and that great confusions must arise.

3. We affirm that such bodies having been established and being maintained by just authority, every man is bound to endeavor the upholding of them by obedience, by peaceable and compliant demeanor.

4. We acknowlege it a great crime, by factious behavior in them, or by needless separation from them, to disturb them, to divide them, to dissolve or subvert them.†

5. We conceive it fit that every people under one prince (or at least of one nation, using the same language, civil law, and fashions) should be united in the bands of ecclesiastical polity:‡

* Lat. Syn. Sess. x. p. 129.

† We allow the Apost. Can. 31.

If any person, despising his own bishop, shall set up a separate meeting, and build another altar, having nothing to condemn in his bishop, either for his piety or uprightness, let him be deposed as one that ambitiously affects to be a governor, &c.

‡ Syn. Rom. apud. Theod. ii. 22.

for that such a unity apparently is conducible to the peace and welfare both of Church and State; to the furtherance of God's worship and service; to the edification of people in charity and piety: by the encouragement of secular powers, by the concurrent advice and aid of ecclesiastical pastors; by many advantages hence arising.

6. We suppose all churches obliged to observe friendly communion; and, when occasion doth invite, to aid each other by assistance and advice, in synods of bishops, or otherwise.

7. We do affirm that all churches are obliged to comply with lawful decrees and orders, appointed in synods with consent of their bishops, and allowed by the civil authorities, under which they live: as if the bishops of Spain and France assembling should agree on constitutions of discipline which the kings of both those countries should approve; and which should not thwart God's laws; both those churches, and every man in them, were bound to comply in observance of them.

From the premises divers corollaries may be deduced.

1. Hence it appeareth that all these clamors of the pretended Catholics against other churches, for not submitting to the Roman chair, are groundless; they depending on the supposition that all churches must necessarily be united under one government.

2. The injustice of the adherents to that see; in claiming an empire (or jurisdiction) over all, which never was designed by our Lord; heavily censuring and fiercely persecuting those who will not acknowlege it.

3. All churches which have a fair settlement in several countries, are coordinate; neither can one challenge a jurisdiction over the other.

4. The nature of schism is hence declared: viz. that it consisteth in disturbing the order and peace of any single church; in withdrawing from it obedience and compliance with it; in obstructing good correspondence, charity, peace, between several churches; in condemning or censuring other churches without just cause, or beyond due measure.

In refusing to maintain communion with other churches, without reasonable cause: whence Firmilian did challenge Pope Stephanus with schism.*

5. Hence the right way of reconciling dissensions among Christians is not affecting to set up a political union of several

* Firmil. apud Cypr. Ep. 75.

churches, or subordination of all to one power; not for one church to enterprise on the liberty of others, or to bring others under it, (as is the practice of the Roman church and its abettors,) but for each church to let the others alone, quietly enjoying its freedom in ecclesiastical administrations; only declaring against apparently hurtful errors and factions; showing goodwill, yielding succor, advice, comfort, on needful occasion; according to that excellent advice of the Constantinopolitan Fathers to the Pope and western bishops—(after having acquainted them with their proceedings) towards the conclusion they thus exhort them,

"We having in a legal and canonical way determined these controversies, do beseech your reverence to congratulate with us, your charity spiritually interceding, the fear of the Lord also compressing all human affection, so as to make us to prefer the edification of the churches to all private respect and favor toward each other; for by this means the word of faith being consonant among us, and Christian charity bearing sway over us, we shall cease from speaking after that manner which the Apostle condemns, 'I am of Paul, and I am of Apollos, but I am of Cephas;' for if we all do appear to be of Christ, who is not divided amongst us, we shall then through God's grace preserve the body of the Church from schism, and present ourselves before the throne of Christ with boldness."*

6. All that withdraw their communion or obeisance from particular churches fairly established, (unto which they do belong, or where they reside,) do incur the guilt of schism; for for such persons being *de jure* subject to those particular churches, and excommunicating themselves, do consequentially sever themselves from the Catholic Church; they commit great wrong toward that particular church, and toward the whole Church of Christ.†

7. Neither doth their pretence of joining themselves to the Roman church excuse them from schism; for the Roman church hath no reason or right to admit or to avow them; it hath no power to exempt or excuse them from their duty;‡ it thereby abetteth their crime, and involveth itself therein; it wrongeth other churches. As no man is freed from his allegiance by pretending to put himself under the protection of another prince; neither can another prince justly receive such disloyal revolters into his patronage.

§ It is a rule grounded on apparent equity, and frequently

* Theod. v. 9. † Aug. contra Jul. Ep. 2.
‡ Syn. Sard. Can. 13. Gr. § Thornd. Lat. p. 220.

declared by ecclesiastical canons, that no church shall admit into its protection or communion any persons who are excommunicated by another church, or who do withdraw themselves from it: (for self-excommunication, or spiritual felony *de se*, doth involve the church's excommunication, deserving it, and preventing it.)*

Which canon, as the African Fathers do allege and expound it, doth prohibit the Pope himself from receiving persons rejected by any other church.†

So when Marcion, having been excommunicated by his own father, coming to Rome, did sue to be received by that church into communion, they refused, telling him that, "they could not do it without the consent of his reverend father, between whom and them there being one faith and one agreement of mind, they could not do it in opposition to their worthy fellow-laborer, who was also his father."‡

St. Cyprian refused to admit Maximus (sent from the Novatian party) to communion.§

So did Pope Cornelius reject Felicissimus, condemned by St. Cyprian, without farther inquiry.||

It was charged on Dioscorus as a heinous misdemeanor, that "he had, against the holy canons, by his proper authority, received into communion persons excommunicated by others."¶

The African synod (at the suggestion of St. Austin) decreed, that "if it happened that any for their evil deeds were deservedly expelled out of the Church, and taken again into communion by any bishop or priest whosoever, that he also who received him should incur the same penalty of excommunication."**

The same is by latter papal synods decreed.††

The words of Synesius are remarkable: he, having excommunicated some cruel oppressors, doth thus recommend the case to all Christians.‡‡

"On which grounds I do not scruple to affirm the recusants in England to be no less schismatics than any other separatists.

* Apost. Can. 12. Conc. Nic. Can. 5.

† Syn. Afr. Epist. ad P. Celest. I. Conc. Ant. Can. 6. Idem in Concil. Sard. Can. 13. 14. (Græc.)

‡ Epiph. Hær. 42. § Ep. lv. p. 113. || Ep. lv. init.

¶ Epist. Syn. Chalced. ad Imper. Act. iv. pag. 286. Evagr. ii. 4.

** Cod. Afr. Can. 9.

†† P. Urb. II. Epist. 20. (apud Bin.) Conc. Lat. I. (sub P. Calixto II.) cap. 9.

‡‡ Epist. 58. pag. 203. edit. Petav.

They are indeed somewhat worse; for most others do only forbear communion, these do rudely condemn the Church, to which they owe obedience; yea, strive to destroy it: they are most desperate rebels against it."*

8. It is the duty and interest of all churches to disclaim the pretences of the Roman court; maintaining their liberties and rights against its usurpations: for compliance therewith, as it doth greatly prejudice truth and piety; (leaving them to be corrupted by the ambitious, covetous, and voluptuous designs of those men;) so it doth remove the genuine unity of the Church, and peace of Christians; unless to be tied by compulsory chains (as slaves) be deemed unity or peace.

9. Yet those churches, which, by the voluntary consent or command of princes, do adhere in confederation to the Roman church, we are not, merely on that score, to condemn or reject from communion of charity or peace; (for in that they do but use their liberty.)

10. But if such churches do maintain impious errors; if they do prescribe naughty practices; if they do reject communion and peace on reasonable terms; if they vent unjust and uncharitable censures; if they are turbulent and violent, striving by all means to subdue and enslave other churches to their will or their dictates—if they damn and persecute all who refuse to be their subjects: in such cases we may reject such churches as heretical or schismatical, or wickedly uncharitable and unjust in their proceedings.†

* P. Leo. Ep. lxxxiv. cap. 9.

† Gelas. Ep. 1. ad Euphem. P. Sym. I. Ep. 7.

INDEX OF PASSAGES

WHEREIN TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE ARE COMMENTED ON AND EXPLAINED.

VOL. I.

	Page		Page
1 Kings i. 25	226	Matt. x. 22	194
2 —— xi. 12	227	Luke xviii. 1	135
1 Chron. xx. 17	230	—— xxi. 36	201
2 —— vii. 16	293 &c.	1 Cor. vi. 20	88
Ps. xiv. 1	194	Eph. vi. 18	201
—— lxiii. 5. 6	148	Phil. iv. 8	86
Prov. x. 9	106	Heb. vi. 17	296
Isai. xxvi. 9	257	—— xiii. 15	198
Dan. viii. 11	144. 198	1 Pet. iv. 8	421

VOL. II.

Deut. xxi. 23	399	1 Cor. ix. 20-22.	276. 293 &c.
Prov. x. 7	375	Eph. v. 20	210
Isai. liii. 12	392	Gal. i. 10	300
Matt. v. 48	175	1 Thess. v. 17	439
Luke vi. 30	326 &c.	Jas. v. 3	362
—— xiv. 26	138	1 Pet. iv. 8	218
—— xviii. 1	439	1 Joh. ii. 15	137
Joh. iii. 14. xii. 32	404		

VOL. III.

Ps. xxxix. 4	191	1 Thess. i. 3	287
Prov. iv. 23	154	Jude 16	114
—— xxi. 25	25	Rev. ii. 3	392
Isai. lix. 5	317		

VOL. IV.

Exod. xxiv. 6	98	1 Cor. x. 31	17
Joel ii. 13	98	—— xv. 53	363 &c.
Joh. iii. 5	288	2 Cor. iv. 3	210
Rom. iii. 23. 24	160	Ephes. i. 13	288
—— ix. 11-13. 15.	114	1 Joh. v. 19	156
1 Cor. i. 25	314	Rev. iii. 20	192

VOL. V.

	Page
Gen. i. 27	234
—— -- 31	296
—— ii. 2	210
2 Sam. xv. 4	125
Job i. 6. xxxviii. 7	232
Ps. lxxxii. 3	125
—- cv. 15	393 &c.
Isai. lxv. 17	356 &c.
Jer. xxxiii. 15	388. 397
Joh. iii. 3	238
—— x. 30	521
—— xvi. 8. 9	6
Acts i. 6	399
Rom. iii. 26. iv. 5. viii. 33	122 &c.
——- vi. 7. viii. 30	138
2 Cor. v. 18. 19	104
Gal. iii. 26	32 &c.
—— iv. 5	237
Ephes. ii. 14	340
Coloss. i. 15	512
——— — 16	284
——— iii. 10	178
Tit. iii. 5-7	138
Heb. vii. 18. viii. 7	344
—— xi. 2	512
Jas. ii. 18	82 &c.

VOL. VI.

Gen. i. 31	439 &c.
Deut. xxi. 23	86 &c.
Ps. xvi. 10	537
— xviii. 4. 5	521
— lxviii. 18	202
— lxxxix. 48	139
—- cx. 1	9
Jer. l. 34	422
Luke xxiii. 31	528
Joh. xii. 32	92
Acts v. 31	319
1 Cor. iv. 5	252
Coloss. i. 16	432
Heb. i. 2	291
1 Pet. iii. 19	146
Rev. xx. 12	263 &c.

VOL. VII.

Exod. xxvi.	51
Levit. xix. 16	63
Ps. xv. 3	63
— cvi. 30	34
Matt. iv.	29
—— vi. 9	3
——- — 32	14
—— xx. 25.	153
——- xxii. 37	30
Mark x. 19	64
——- xvi. 16	74
Luke ii. 14	9
——- x. 27	30
Luke xi. 2	3
——- — 3	14
Acts xv. 9	163
1 Cor. vi. 8	61
——— — 11	72
——— xi. 29	82
Gal. i. 6. 7	176
1 Thess. iv. 6	62
Titus i. 16	30
——- ii. 10	61
1 Peter i. 17	9
——— iii. 21	74
2 Pet. iii. 2	161

THE END.

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY, RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01147 2943

Date Due

NOV [redacted]			